

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, AUGUST 12, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

A MATTER of very great importance was decided on Tuesday, in committee on the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, when the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Government, accepted a new clause moved by Mr. Watkin Williams, which provides that all rules of court to be made after the passing of the Act, whether made under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, or the new Act, shall be made by any three or more of the following persons, of whom the Lord Chancellor shall be one, namely, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and four other judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature, to be from time to time appointed for the purpose by the Lord Chancellor in writing under his hand, such appointment to continue for such time as shall be specified therein. We need hardly remind our readers that this is an alteration for which we have for some time past pleading, and we must express our satisfaction that it has, with so little difficulty, been placed in a fair way for passing into law. The truth is, that with so large a body of rule-makers as now exists under the provisions of the Judicature Acts, responsibility becomes so divided that it hardly exists at all. No one is specially concerned to have new rules made, or to see that the new rules are shaped in the best way to meet the difficulties they are intended to remedy. Under the new provisions there will be a small committee, whose duty it will be to superintend the preparation and issue of new rules; and we do not see why an arrangement, which in the case of the county courts has worked excellently well, should not have equally good results when applied to the High Court. The Council of Judges—if ever that august body should meet, in pursuance of section 75 of the Judicature Act, 1873—will be able to afford all the benefits of advice and suggestions which could be derived from the assistance in making rules of the whole body of judges.

THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL has at last passed through all its stages and only awaits the Royal assent. As we have from time to time commented upon this measure during its progress we refrain at present from any general discussion of its effects, reserving to ourselves the right of a general survey of its provisions after it shall have passed into law. At present we desire only to express our regret that, when the Government determined upon acquiescing, at the last moment, in the suggestions of Sir Henry James and Sir William Harcourt respecting the conduct of business in the common law divisions, the opportunity thus presented of alleviating in some degree, if not of remedying, the present most unsatisfactory condition of the Chancery Division was let slip. We know that this was not done through inadvertence; the question was brought prominently under the notice of the Government, not only in

the House of Commons, but in the public press, and by a formal representation from the Law Amendment Society; and we gather from the Lord Chancellor's speech in the House of Lords on Thursday evening that he, at least, is fully aware of the fact that the block in the Chancery Division is not an abnormal or ephemeral phenomenon, but a legitimate and inevitable consequence of the changes introduced by the Judicature Acts. We acknowledge, as readily as the most thorough-going disciple of the late "Joe Hume" could wish, that it is very desirable to avoid any permanent increase in the judicial staff of the country that can reasonably be done without, but here was an occasion on which an admitted evil of great magnitude might have been palliated, if not redressed, without any countervailing sacrifice whatever, and the chance has been, almost contemptuously, let go, without assigning the shadow of a reason, or even of an excuse. Nor can any effectual remedy now be devised for a considerable time to come; it is obvious that no such change in the distribution of the judges as is required for the purpose can be effected without the authority of Parliament, and it is too much to hope that that authority can be obtained before the lapse of another year has aggravated the evil to an intolerable extent. The case, however, though not now admitting of any effectual remedy, is still capable of being relieved in a certain—very limited—degree, and we trust that, rather than suffer the continuance and accumulation of arrears with which we are now threatened, the judges will see their way to adopt the plan suggested some time ago in this journal (*ante*, p. 582), or some similar plan. Doubtless, the suitors would prefer having their causes decided by a genuine judge—albeit of exclusively common law antecedents—rather than be handed over to a "chief official referee" or "extra official referee" (or by whatever name the proposed *pro-judge* might be called), but we feel sure that, rather than submit to the prolonged delay inevitable in the existing position of affairs, they would gladly accept the decisions of any one of the numerous gentlemen of standing and eminence at the equity bar whose services might be easily secured for temporary purposes in the manner before pointed out.

THE MOST VIOLENT ATTACK yet delivered on the important new clauses in the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, which will now very soon be passed into law, is contained in the letter from Mr. Justice Brett read by Lord Coleridge to the House of Lords on Thursday evening. The learned judge calls the new proposals an "alteration in a panic," and speaks of "the extreme danger and ruin of a scheme which seems to me to be utterly thoughtless." Surely to justify such expressions as these there ought to be stronger reasons alleged against the proposal than those which he brings forward. His arguments, shortly stated, are as follows:—First, the block at *Nisi Prius* in London and Middlesex is "probably" only temporary. What reason is there to suppose this? The learned judge does not give any. Secondly, there is an "essential difference between causes tried by juries and those tried before Vice-Chancellors"; this difference, so far as we can make it out, consists in the circumstance that the causes in the common law divisions "are those which arise in the ever-varying transactions of every-day life"; new combinations arise in business, and new applications of law have to be made; at *Nisi Prius*, "from want of time and books," it is practically impossible to determine each new point. The answer is obvious. Do not the causes in the Chancery Division also largely relate to the ever-varying transactions of every-day life? Does the learned judge imagine that the four judges of first instance in the Chancery Division are not called upon singly to administer mercantile law? It is true that the common law divisions practically mould large parts of this law; but is there any reason to suppose that a single judge of a common law division, with all his familiarity with this branch

of law, will find it more difficult to deal with new combinations than the less-experienced equity judge? If neither time nor books are at present to be found at *Nisi Prius*, perhaps both may be found hereafter. But it is not required by the new proposals that the judge shall determine upon the application of the law to the facts at the trial; he may do so afterwards. Where, then, is the force of this objection? But Mr. Justice Brett proceeds to point out, and repeats at the close of his letter, that the result will be to increase appeals. So we have always said, and this is doubtless an evil; but the experience of the present year is not such as to lead us to suppose that the evil will reach any great dimensions. There have been, it appears, 200 appeals from the division where four single-judge courts sit, as against 129 from the other divisions, in which we may reckon, we suppose, that four courts in *Banc* (reckoning the Probate and Divorce Division as one) sit. The difference in the number of appeals is really a great deal less than we should have expected. Again, Mr. Justice Brett suggests that if judges sit singly "all idea of authority" must cease, and "reported cases must cease." Why? Do the decisions of the single judge who sits at the Rolls carry no authority? Are there no reported cases in the Chancery Division? Next, he asks how the work is to be distributed, and afterwards asks how the miscellaneous duties of the judges, such as the Divisional Court for Appeals from Inferior Courts, the special paper in each division, the Central Criminal Court, election petitions, &c., are to be performed. We pointed out a few weeks ago (*ante*, p. 719) how this would probably be done. The result we showed would be, after providing for all this special work, to leave six judges available for *Nisi Prius* sittings on 120 days, and three on 100 days, in the legal year. Lastly, he says, "Is not the veiled idea, the idea of doing away with trial by jury?" We look for the proof, but the learned judge again gives us none, and we confess we have some difficulty in dealing with "veiled ideas." On the whole, we think the Government may thank Mr. Justice Brett for his letter. If this is really all that can be said by an experienced and able member of the bench of the common law divisions, there can be but little harm in the new proposals.

WE ARE NOT SURPRISED that there are signs of a renewed agitation for a repeal or modification of the certificate duty. The wonder is that in the course of the discussions on the Judicature Acts no serious effort has been made in this direction. Since Mr. Denman's Bill to reduce the duty was thrown out on the third reading, in 1867, the question has been allowed to go to sleep, apparently for want of a champion sufficiently energetic and interested in the matter to fight a Bill through the House of Commons. The history of previous efforts is by no means discouraging. In 1860 a Bill for the abolition of the duty was read a second time in the Commons; in the next year, and in 1853, a Bill for the same purpose was introduced; and in 1867 a motion in favour of the abolition of the duty was carried in the House of Commons. It is to be feared that the tax is too easily collected and too profitable to be wholly surrendered by the Government; but the case for an equalization between town and country solicitors seems too strong to be resisted, and if properly stated must secure some action in the next session. The London solicitor has now few advantages over his country brethren; he has usually to pay a great deal more for office rent, and often gives higher salaries to his clerks; why, then, should he be charged with a higher rate of duty? There is, we believe, an apprehension in some quarters that the result of stirring in the matter might be that the country solicitor's rate of duty would be raised to that of the London solicitor; but we cannot believe that, if proper representations were made, this idea would be entertained by the Government.

TRIAL OF CHANCERY ACTIONS AT ASSIZES.

IN the midst of all the hubbub that has been made on the subject of issues sent down from the Chancery Division for trial at the assizes, a quiet little proceeding has taken place to which we think the attention of the profession ought to be directed.

A week or two ago we gave a short note of a motion before Bacon, V.C., for an order that a partnership action of *Redmayne v. Vaughan*, attached to his branch of the Chancery Division, should be set down for trial at the then approaching Liverpool Assizes (see *ante*, p. 744, and this week's issue of the WEEKLY REPORTER, p. 983). The application was based on the ground that the plaintiff, in his statement of claim, had stated that he proposed that the action should be tried at Liverpool, the contention being that ord. 36, r. 1, applies to all actions in the High Court, whatever may be the division to which they have been assigned, whether by the election of the parties, or, as in the case of partnership actions, by the express provisions of the Act of 1873. The Vice-Chancellor acceded to the application, and though, of course, the associate at Liverpool hesitated to obey the order, his hesitation was overcome by a direction from Bramwell, B., one of the judges on the circuit. Accordingly, as will be seen from a report in another column, the action came on for trial on Monday last, as it happened, before Lindley, J., who no doubt experienced a pleasant feeling of refreshment at finding himself so unexpectedly in his native air of equity, and the law and practice of partnership. The jury having been dispensed with by agreement, oral evidence was gone into with respect to the main question between the parties, namely, whether the defendant was to bring in as his share of the capital in the brewery business, the subject of the partnership, the sum of £1,600, or, as he himself alleged, certain interests in some public-houses. This question having been decided against the defendant the learned judge pronounced a final judgment which we have been informed was to the following effect:—Decree dissolution; continue receiver; accounts to be taken by the district registrar, with a direction that the defendant is to be debited with £1,600; the costs occasioned by the defendant's disputing his liability to bring in the £1,600 to be paid by him; the defendant to execute a release of his interest in the brewery; liberty to apply.

It will be seen from this statement that the effect of the whole proceeding has been to dispose finally of a chancery action with witnesses at the assizes; the method adopted having this advantage over issues that the expense has been avoided (1) of settling the issues, and (2) of the hearing before the Vice-Chancellor after the trial of the issues. The event might, of course, have turned out differently. The judge of assize might, after trying the case, have declined to direct judgment to be entered, leaving the parties to move for judgment (see ord. 36, r. 22). Had that course been adopted, the result would have been practically a second trial, though, of course, without witnesses, before the Vice-Chancellor, with, perhaps, a rather troublesome question as to whether his lordship was in a position fairly to exercise his discretion as to the costs of the suit. It follows from this that all that can safely be said of the recent case is that, partly, perhaps, owing to exceptionally favourable circumstances, the first experiment of trying a chancery action at assizes has turned out a success. Doubts may, perhaps, be suggested as to whether the rule under which the plaintiff claimed to have the right to fix the place of trial was intended to apply to all actions, or only to actions in which there was a local venue before the Judicature Acts (see the wording of the rule itself). But the broader view seems to us to be the better one, namely, that the rules are a code of procedure for all actions in the High Court, so that, as far

as the procedure covered by the rules is concerned, all actions are on precisely the same footing.

It may, perhaps, be startling to find a chancery action the pleadings in which bear the name of a Vice-Chancellor, passing through its most important phase under the guidance of a judge of assize, and to see the latter judge framing a judgment the working out of which may be left to the Vice-Chancellor. In the recent case, however, three judges of great experience, namely, Bacon, V.C., and Bramwell and Lindley, JJ., have acquiesced in this view of the new procedure; and the question, thus weighted with their authority, must come before the consideration of the body of judges when they will shortly be engaged in framing new rules. It is needless to point out that many important interests must be affected by what is done or left undone on this subject; and, unfortunately, perhaps, for the entire satisfaction of the outside public, the matter touches rather too closely the personal convenience and comfort of some of those learned persons to whom the making of the rules has been intrusted. Those, however, who have a better acquaintance with the character of the bench will be very slow to think that such considerations will have any influence whatever on the manner in which the question will be dealt with. Shortly stated, the question is this—Shall a person so circumstanced as to be obliged to sue in the Chancery Division, and whose advisers are qualified to judge of all the reasons for and against a trial of the action at or near the place where they themselves, the parties, and the witnesses all reside, have the option of choosing that the trial shall take place there, or shall he not? There are, no doubt, many reasons of great weight on both sides; and we shall do no more than commend the consideration of them to the learned body of judges.

ROBERT FARRE DALRYMPLE.

THE death of Mr. Robert Farre Dalrymple, for many years, and until the close of 1875, a solicitor in active practice, ought not to pass without some notice in these columns. His life, though busy, was not eventful, but it has left to his friends memories of high honour, unobtrusive goodness and refinement, which will not soon fade.

Mr. Dalrymple was born at Norwich on the 26th of January, 1819, and was the youngest son of the late William Dalrymple, long and favourably known there as a surgeon of great distinction and of far more than local reputation—the pupil of the elder Cline and the valued friend of that great man, of Sir Astley Cooper, and of many of the leading anatomists and pathologists of his day. He was, with his brothers, educated, so far as school education is concerned, at the Free School of Norwich under Dr. Valpy, as his father had also been under the memorable Dr. Parr; but that part of a man's education which, more than any other, makes or mars him—the imparting of good impulses, the founding of energetic habits, and the love of high and honourable motives came to him whose death we are recording from the precept and example of his singularly refined and active-minded parents—a father of rare talents and acquirements and of fastidious honour; a mother who won her children to the same habit of extensive reading and love of knowledge by which her own mind had been stored and strengthened.

Mr. R. F. Dalrymple was articled in 1836 to Mr. Robert Bayly Follett, now the well-known taxing master, and during the greater part of his apprenticeship had, under Mr. Follett, the opportunity of acquiring the knowledge of his future professional duties, and of the means and manner of performing them, in the chambers of Messrs. Gregory & Co., of Bedford-row. In 1845 he became a member of the firm of Bircham, Dalrymple, Drake, & Co., of Westminster, and so continued until, in December last, he retired. To this step

he was induced by failing health and the desire to spend his remaining time with more leisure for domestic life, and for indulging his love of gentle travel and society, of books and of art, and as a Christian gentleman "for the adjustment of his mantle." But a few months were accorded to him of that longer evening of days which he had pictured to himself.

His professional avocations were always sufficient mainly to occupy his time and mind. Nor could his health have allowed him to carry through more. He was not a great lawyer. Few largely occupied solicitors can be so. Neither did he busy himself in the politics of his profession, its education or interests, but he did better in giving its members a high and stainless example. His peculiar temperament and good sense made him a valuable adviser: and whilst no one, who knew him well, would challenge his ability, it was not from the exercise of great powers, but from his high moral tone and the well-adjusted balance of his mind, that his success in practice principally resulted. Few solicitors have won more completely the confidence and regard of the clients whom he served (evidenced by the many who became his friends, and called upon him to undertake for them important trusts), or of the professional brethren amongst whom he moved.

He had been for many years before his death a committee-governor of Christ's Hospital, and throughout each of the two great discussions of a few years ago on the then scheme for re-organizing that great institution, he served on the special committee of governors, and took a part which will be long remembered, by those who were engaged with him, as most energetic and useful. Nor was this the only institution which had the benefit of his benevolence and judgment; but his charity—both in its public and private development—whilst large and discriminating, was essentially silent and unobtrusive.

Mr. Dalrymple married, in 1849, Anne, the second daughter of the late Mr. Francis John Gunning, of Cambridge. She survives him. There was one child only of the marriage, Mr. Bertram Francis Dalrymple, now a lieutenant in the Royal Artillery.

On Monday, before the Queen's Bench Division, Mr. Glyn moved for a rule calling upon a solicitor to answer the matters in the affidavit of the applicant, but Mr. Justice Quain said it was a rule not to allow an application of this kind to be made on the last day or last day but one of a term or sitting, the reason being that the matter would be kept hanging over the head of the solicitor during the vacation, and on that ground the court declined to hear the application.

On Tuesday, before the Queen's Bench Division, says the *Times* reporter, Mr. Anderson desired to move for a criminal information, but the court, at the instance of the Crown master, at once stopped him, reminding him of an ancient rule of practice that such an application could not be made on the last day of a sitting, as it would not be right to keep it hanging over the head of a party all through the long vacation. This rule of practice, they said, they adhered to, as it had not been altered by the rules under the Judicature Act, and they had applied it to an application against an attorney, which was refused for the same reason. It was then suggested that possibly the application might be made at the sittings *in Banco* during the vacation, if, as had been supposed, such sittings were to be held occasionally. But as to this, Mr. Justice Mellor said it was a mistake, and no such sittings were to be held. Mr. Justice Quain said two of his brethren, no doubt (Mr. Justice Field and Mr. Baron Huddleston), were to sit as the vacation judges at chambers throughout the vacation, and they had by the Act a power to hold a "divisional court" on any occasion which might arise to call for it. But, he believed, and, indeed, he knew, through communication with them, that they did not intend to exercise that power or to hold any such sitting except on some extraordinary occasion or emergency.

The New Practice.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

NEW TRIAL—TIME FOR MOVING—DIVISIONAL COURT NOT SITTING—ORD. 39, R. 1.—The question which was raised before the Court of Appeal in the case of *Hallums v. Hills* (noted ante p. 763) was again mooted on the 7th inst., in a case of *Algood v. Gibson*. In *Hallums v. Hills*, the Court of Appeal expressed their opinion that the meaning of ord. 39, r. 1, is that, when the divisional court is not sitting every day, only the days on which it actually sits are to be counted in estimating the four days allowed for moving for a new trial. In *Algood v. Gibson* the dates were these:—The trial took place on Thursday, the 13th of July. The divisional court did not sit until Monday, the 17th of July, and after that it sat on Monday, the 24th, Tuesday, the 25th, and Monday, the 31st of July. On the 31st a motion was made for a new trial, and the divisional court (Lord Coleridge, C.J., Kelly, C.B., and Archibald, J.) held that the application was made too late. The construction which they put upon the rule was this: that the motion for a new trial must be made within four days after the trial, provided the last of those days be one upon which the divisional court is sitting; and, if not, then on the next day on which the divisional court is sitting. They also held that there was no power to extend the time after it had actually run out. The motion for a new trial was renewed by way of appeal on the 7th inst. The Court of Appeal (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) intimated an opinion that the divisional court were not absolutely bound by the previous decision of the Court of Appeal, which had been given only upon an *ex parte* application, and they said that the question was one of great importance and ought to be fully argued, and declined, therefore, to decide it now, but ordered the motion to stand over till November.

SUBSTITUTED SERVICE—DISCRETION OF COURT—NON-EXISTENT DEFENDANT—ACTION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF A COLONY—ORD. 9, R. 2.—On the 8th inst., in a case of *Sloman v. The Governor and Government of the Colony of New Zealand*, the Court of Appeal were asked to discharge an order which had been made for substituted service of the writ of summons under very peculiar circumstances. The action was brought in the Common Pleas Division to recover damages for the alleged breach of a contract which had been entered into, on behalf of the Government of New Zealand, with a shipowner, for the conveyance of emigrants from Europe to the colony. The parties to the contract were Her Majesty the Queen, for and on behalf of the colony of New Zealand, of the first part; the agent-general in England for the Government of the colony, as agent for and on behalf of the Government, of the second part; and the shipowner, of the third part. An Act of the colonial Legislature had empowered the Government of the colony to enter into such contracts, but another Act had provided that they were to be entered into in the name of the Queen, her heirs and successors. It was contended that the effect of these Acts was to make the Governor and Government of the colony, or at any rate the Governor, a corporation for the purpose of contracting, and that they could be sued as such. And the divisional court (Lord Coleridge, C.J., and Archibald, J.), though they doubted whether the action could be maintained, thought that this question might not be determined upon an interlocutory motion, and granted an order for substituted service upon the London solicitor who had acted on behalf of the colonial Government. The solicitor appealed from the order, and the Court of Appeal (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) discharged it with costs. They were of opinion that the court, having a discretion as to the making of the order, ought not to allow substituted service where direct service would be impossible. Here the action was clearly not maintainable. The very object of the provision that the contracts should be made in the name of the Queen was that the executive officers should not be liable to be sued upon them. The Governor and Government were not a corporation. The nominal defendants were, as Lord Justice James expressed

it, a fictitious nonentity, and there was no one who could be served with the writ directly in New Zealand. The plaintiff's only remedy was by a petition of right in the Supreme Court of the colony.

Notes.

IN A CASE OF *Re Collie*, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 3rd inst., a question of some importance arose with regard to the right of a creditor holding a security to prove in bankruptcy. At the time of the bankruptcy of A. & W. Collie, partners, they owed a large debt to their bankers, who were a limited joint stock company. Some shares in the bank stood in the name of A. Collie alone. They had stood in his name for many years, and were in the first instance his own, but they afterwards became in fact, as between himself and his partner, the property of the firm. The bank, however, had no knowledge that any one but A. Collie had any interest in the shares. The articles of association of the bank contained the ordinary provision that the shares of every shareholder should be always subject to a lien thereon in favour of the bank for all moneys from time to time due from him to the bank in respect of any call, or as a debt or liability to the bank from him alone, or jointly with any other person. The whole of the debt to the bank had been contracted since the shares had become partnership property. Under these circumstances it was contended on the part of the trustees in the bankruptcy that, as the bank held a security on that which was *de facto* joint estate, they could not prove against the joint estate without first deducting the value of the shares, and so Mr. Registrar Murray decided, following *Ex parte Connell*, 3 Den. 201, a case decided by the three judges of the court of review in 1838 (Sir John Cross, however, dissenting), and the only reported case in which the point had previously arisen. On behalf of the bank it was contended that the bankrupts had in effect made a representation to them that the shares were the property of A. Collie alone, and that on the faith of that representation the debt had been contracted, and that consequently the bankrupts, and those claiming through them, were estopped from saying that the shares were not the property of A. Collie alone. And, moreover, it was urged that the shares in their first inception were subject to the paramount lien created by the articles, and that this right could not be destroyed by any dealing to which the bank were not parties. The Court of Appeal (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.), however, affirmed the registrar's decision. James, L.J., said that, if he had been free to act on his own opinion, he should have allowed the claim of the bank to prove for the whole debt, on the ground that they were entitled to the benefit of the representation which the Collies had in effect made to them, whatever might be the legal consequences. But his lordship said that, even if his colleagues agreed with him, it would not, perhaps, be right to overrule the decision in *Ex parte Connell*, which had never been questioned since it was pronounced. Mellish, L.J., said that the lien was clearly a security on the joint estate, for if it had not existed the shares would have been part of the joint estate. The question was, not what was the contract between the bank and the Collies, but what were the respective rights of the bank and the other joint creditors, and the bankrupts could not by any contract or representation made by them prevent their estate being distributed according to the rules of administration in bankruptcy. The question did not really relate to the security given by the articles of association, which would remain unaffected in any event, but to the right of proof in respect of the balance of the debt which was uncovered by the security, and that must depend simply upon the bankruptcy law.

THE SAME DAY the Court of Appeal affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Re Balbirnie*, which we noted ante, p. 704. The facts were briefly these:—Before a debtor filed his liquidation petition a creditor had lodged a writ of *f. fa.* with the sheriff. The creditors resolved to

accept a composition, and after the resolutions had been registered the sheriff levied under the writ. The Chief Judge held that the execution creditor, not having levied before the composition resolutions became binding, was not a secured creditor, and was consequently bound by the resolutions and could not enforce his execution. And, moreover, he had, at the second meeting, proved for the full amount of his debt, and had voted in favour of the composition, and by doing this had forfeited any security which he had. The Court of Appeal agreed with the Chief Judge on both these grounds. They also were clearly of opinion that the writ of *f. fa.* could not, under the circumstances, have been delivered to the sheriff for the *bond fide* purpose of being executed (in fact, it was practically admitted that it was held over at the debtor's request), and therefore, even before the Mercantile Law Amendment Act (19 & 20 Vict. c. 97), the writ would not have bound third parties. And, moreover, in this case it appeared that, before the levy under the writ, the debtor had executed a bill of sale of his property as security to a person who had advanced the money to pay the composition, and therefore, by section 1 of the Mercantile Law Amendment Act, the seizure could not effect the right of the bill of sale holder. The decisions in *Re Balbirnie* and in *Ex parte Jones* (23 W. R. 836, L. R. 10 Ch. 663) go a long way towards settling the rights of execution creditors in cases of composition.

ON THE SAME DAY the Court of Appeal affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Wildsmith*, which we noted *ante*, p. 724, to the effect that, under r. 61 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1870, a debtor's summons may be served by a clerk of the summoning creditor's solicitor, or by the clerk of the solicitor's country (or London) agent, and that it is not necessary, as was contended, that the service should be made by the solicitor whose name is indorsed on the summons with his own hand.

ON THE SAME DAY the Court of Appeal decided, in a case of *Re Newman*, a point of importance with regard to proof in bankruptcy for damages recovered in an action of tort. A debtor filed a liquidation petition on the 6th of May. On the 3rd of June the creditors at their first meeting resolved to accept a composition. This resolution was confirmed at the second meeting on the 13th of June, and the resolutions were registered on the 29th of June. On the 14th of January previous the plaintiff in an action of tort against the debtor had obtained a verdict for £50 damages. Leave had been reserved to the defendant to move to have the verdict entered for him, and on the 26th of April his motion was refused, and the court ordered judgment to be entered for the plaintiff for £50 and costs. On the 17th of June (*i.e.*, after the second meeting of the creditors), the costs having been meanwhile taxed, the plaintiff in the action signed judgment for the £50 and £83 costs. The question was whether the plaintiff was bound by the composition in respect of the £133, and this depended upon the question whether the £133 was a debt or liability of the debtor provable in the composition under section 31 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. The court held that it was not, and consequently that the plaintiff was at liberty to enforce the judgment against the debtor. The court were of opinion that section 31 does not alter the old law that damages recovered in an action of tort cannot be proved in bankruptcy unless, not only a verdict has been obtained, but judgment has been signed before the adjudication. Till that had been done the damages were still unliquidated. This decision appears somewhat to conflict with the opinion expressed by the Court of Appeal in *Ex parte Peacock* (21 W. R. 765, L. R. 8 Ch. 682), that the defendant's costs of an unsuccessful action brought by a compounding debtor were provable in the composition, though they were not taxed and judgment for the amount was not signed until after the registration of the composition resolutions. The point, however, was not necessary for the decision of that case, inasmuch as the debtor had, in his statement of affairs, inserted as one of his liabilities the estimated amount of the costs in question (which estimate exceeded the amount at which the costs were afterwards taxed), and the real ground of the decision of the court, allowing the defendants in the action to issue execution against the debtor for the taxed costs, appears to have been that the

composition had never been tendered to them by the debtor—a tender which he was bound to make because the estimated liability had been included in his statement of affairs.

THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

LORD COLERIDGE on Thursday evening read, in the House of Lords, the following letter which he had received from Mr. Justice Brett with reference to the new clauses in this Bill:—

"First, it is alteration in a panic of legislation hardly yet dry. This block of causes at *Nisi Prius* in London and Middlesex is probably only temporary. Secondly, the proposed plan ignores entirely the essential difference between the causes tried before juries and those tried before Vice-Chancellors. The causes in the common law divisions are those which arise in the ever-varying transactions of every-day life. There is not a month, or even a week, in which some new combination does not arise in business, and therefore some totally new application of law does not arise. It seems never to be understood by those who are not conversant with the administration of law by judge and jury that the trial before the jury is to ascertain what are the facts of that new combination, and that the law must be applied after the facts are ascertained. Let any one look into the reports, and he will see how incessantly new business, which is, in other words, a new point of law, arises. It is practically impossible, from want of time and books, that each new point should be determined at the *Nisi Prius* trial, as Mr. Gregory's amendment, for instance, supposes it could be. If the point were then to be determined, either *Nisi Prius* trials must be postponed for months, or the number of judges and courts must be increased by sixty. And if each new point were reserved for the determination of the same judge sitting in London or for another single judge sitting alone, it is practically impossible to suppose that the number of appeals would not be increased ten or twenty fold. Suppose an opinion expressed by Baron Bramwell or Mr. Justice Blackburn, let us say, at the trial, referred to any judge you may think wholly inferior, or whom the public may think wholly inferior, and his judgment is different from the opinion; or even if the single judgment be that of the most trusted of the judges. The assumption is that the point or application is new. Now, is it possible to suppose that it will be acquiesced in? I will give two or three instances which are recent—the crossed cheques, the negotiability of foreign bonds or coupons, the questions now raised as to disclosures or concealments in a prospectus, customs of the Stock Exchange, &c. The truth is, that the proposal would make the Court of Appeal the only court in *Banc*, and so the House of Lords the first instead of the Second Court of Appeal. It is only, in fact, upon the question of a suggested misdirection that the courts in *Banc* are a court of appeal. As to points reserved or special cases or other motions, they are a court of first instance upon questions of law. It may be that a single judge should more often sit to hear points of practice; but that requires no legislation. Thirdly, if the judges are to determine each of them singly these questions of law which so constantly arise, all idea of authority, which has hitherto been the backbone of the consistency of the law, must cease. Surely it cannot be supposed that the decision of a single judge is to be cited as a binding authority to another single judge. Such things as reported cases, which are now more useful even to prevent litigation than to guide it, must cease. No lawyer will be able to advise his client that the point has been decided by a binding authority; at all events, not till the Court of Appeal has decided; and so, again, appeals must multiply. Fourthly, how is the work to be distributed? Three judges in the Court of Appeal—are these to be three sitting singly, as it were, in *Banc*? If so, are there to be six at *Nisi Prius* and one at chambers? That gives thirteen. Are five to be idle? Or are there to be more than three courts in *Banc* or more than six at *Nisi Prius*? If yes, where are the courts and the bar? Fifth, what is to become of the peculiar business—the Revenue cases in the Exchequer, the magisterial and other cases in the Queen's Bench, the election cases (parliamentary and municipal) in the Common Pleas? Sixth, is not the veiled idea the idea of doing away with trial by jury? Seventh, I should say that at present nine-tenths of the daily common law disputes—*i.e.*, cases—stop at the court in

Banc, whereas under the proposed system those nine-tenths would almost all go to the Court of Appeal. For these reasons I have no doubt as to the extreme danger and ruin of a scheme which seems to me to be utterly thoughtless."

In the debate on the consideration of the new clauses proposed by the Attorney-General (see *ante*, p. 732)—

Sir H. JAMES said that large issues were raised by the clause and the amendments, and sooner or later they must be discussed. When the Judicature Act came into operation last November, there were sham arrears, which were soon disposed of; but under the working of the Act it had been found that the judicial staff was not equal to the demands made upon it, and it was no exaggeration to say that a dead-lock had resulted. Those who were chiefly prejudiced were the suitors and others who desired to appeal to the courts of law. About six weeks ago attention was called to the number of cases then waiting to be heard. The *Nisi Prius* causes had since increased, so that there were now about 800 waiting for trial, and when the legal year began in November it was possible the number would be increased to 1,000. The subject was brought before the legal members of that House in a communication from Lords Justices James and Baggallay, and they came to the conclusion embodied in the amendments of the Attorney-General. It was then suggested that it was necessary to do two things—to increase the strength of the Court of Appeal by adding to its numbers, and its stability by ceasing to borrow judges from the primary courts. No one could doubt that the appellate judges should be appellate and not primary judges. The question then arose whence this additional strength should be derived. Some thought that it would be better to add at once two or three judges to the court of intermediate appeal. Every unnecessary addition to the number of judges was, however, objectionable on two grounds, because it made all the other judges do less work than need be, and because it lowered the standard of judicial qualification. When a greater demand was made on the profession by creating twenty-four judges where twelve used to be the number, a lower standard was inevitable. The best number of judges was the number required to do the work, and no more. Why, for example, in *Nisi Prius* cases, should there be seen the spectacle of three judges sitting with the greatest solemnity to hear cases which men of the most ordinary intellect would decide off-hand in their counting-houses? In the Court of Chancery a single judge was sufficient for such cases. Why, he asked, instead of having an increased number of judges, should they not, by accepting the second amendment of his hon. friend the Attorney-General, economize judicial strength without affecting the public interest? If one judge could dispose of cases of vast importance in the Court of Chancery, why should not one judge sit in a court of law and dispose of cases there? And all the more ought they to be disposed to assent to the proposed arrangement that the suitor would have two courts of appeal to which he could carry his case if he were so advised. He hoped they would have the courage to support her Majesty's Government in this matter of judicial reform.

Mr. S. HILL was ready to assent to the first clause proposed by the Attorney-General, but in the interest of the public he could not support the second clause, by which, if it were passed, a court of law sitting in *Banc* would consist of one judge only. He asked was the practice in chancery so entirely satisfactory that they could make comparable to it their practice at common law? He compared the position of a Vice-Chancellor in dealing with a case with the position of a judge and a jury, and said that a suitor who goes away from a court in *Banc*, whether the verdict had been for him or against him, goes away with more complete satisfaction as to the result of the case than a man who goes out of the Vice-Chancellor's chamber.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD said it was admitted on all hands that the present Court of Appeal could not keep up with the business. They must at present do with the existing judges, because the Government had declared that under present circumstances they would not increase the number. As to appeals he would rather trust a judge sitting alone to upset his own judgment than a judge sitting with

another to try the appeal. He trusted the amendments would be accepted.

Mr. GRANTHAM maintained that the new system of judicature had not yet obtained fair play. Since its introduction the work before the courts had increased in importance, a great number of small cases which took little time to try being now eliminated from the lists, and it sometimes happened that two or three actions which would formerly have been separate were now rolled into one. Thus the comparison which was made between the present and the past state of things was unfair. As to the question of expense, he believed that the public would not grudge £10,000, or even £20,000 a year for additional judges, who would save enormous cost and delay to suitors. The Judicature Act was passed to produce a fusion of law and equity, so that the same judge might be able to try all the questions connected with a case; but the system did not work in the way which had been expected, and equity judges had sent down issues to be tried at the assizes by the common law judges. It was not fair that one class of judges should be able to relieve themselves at the expense of another, and he could easily understand that there should have been some feeling on the part of judges who were helpless in the matter, because they had a loyal desire to finish the business of their circuits, and were not men to "scamp" their work. In conclusion, he was sorry the measure could not be postponed till another year, when they might have more satisfactory legislation than that before them.

Mr. NORWOOD felt, as a member of the mercantile community, that the operation of the Judicature Act, whatever might be the cause, had not given satisfaction to the public. There was now almost as much difficulty in knowing what court to apply to as ever there had been; the long vacation was longer than ever, and the suitors had none of the facilities for having their cases tried which they had so much reason to hope would be afforded to them. He could not disguise from himself the fact that out of doors it was asserted too frequently that the judges had really not shown that anxious desire to accommodate themselves and the business of their courts to the new system which might have been fairly expected from them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the clause would have the effect of strengthening and improving the intermediate court of appeal, and it had the approval of the bulk of legal members in the House. Having already explained his proposals at length, it was not necessary to say more than that he believed they would be efficacious in securing the reforms that were admitted to be necessary.

Mr. BULWER knew nothing of the caucus of the members of the bar which had been referred to as having approved the amendments proposed by the Attorney-General. For his part, he protested against amendments effecting so important an alteration in our judicial system being discussed in a thin House at that period of the session—amendments which, if carried, would be certain to be rejected by the Lords, and which would thus lead to the loss of the measure. Under the proposal of the Attorney-General, the court in *Banc* would be abolished and the Court of Appeal would be overwhelmed by the business which would flow into it, while our judges would "sit alone in the dark," instead of being educated after they got on the bench, as was the case under the existing system.

The ward clerkships of the wards of Aldgate and Lime-street have become vacant by the death of Mr. Charles Rivington, of Fenchurch-buildings.

The *Morning Post* says that on Thursday morning, at the Oxford Quarter Sessions, before the recorder, Mr. W. H. Cooke, Q.C., which were held by adjournment from July 21, when about fifty citizens who had been summoned as jury-men were discharged owing to Mr. Cooke having missed his train, the recorder censured the mayor for having discharged the jury, and spoke in strong terms of the conduct of the bench of magistrates generally. On the mayor attempting to explain the recorder threatened to fine him £50, and intimated to him that he had no right there except in his capacity as a citizen.

LORD COLERIDGE ON THE WORKING OF THE JUDICATURE ACTS.

On Thursday evening, in the House of Lords, Lord Coleridge said he had laid on the table a notice that he would call attention to the working of the Judicature Acts, and move for a return to supplement one which had been previously obtained. He would take first, the working of the High Court of Justice, which, as their lordships would remember, was divided into five divisions, but for all ordinary purposes into three, namely, the divisions represented by the Vice-Chancellors; by the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer; and by the Probate and Admiralty Courts. The working of the Chancery Division had been somewhat slow, because the most salutary practice of *viva voce* examination had been introduced. Any one who knew anything about the matter would see that if we tried cases by *viva voce* examination they would take up a longer time; but for all that there was no comparison between that system and the system of affidavits for eliciting the truth. Every one knew perfectly well that the result of affidavits drawn by the score, settled by the counsel, and sworn to, perhaps, without much examination, could not for a moment be compared with the result attained by examination and cross-examination *viva voce*. In the Probate and Admiralty Courts there was very little difference, except that as the judge of the Probate Court could call in the judge of the Admiralty, he believed, on the whole, more important work had been got out of that division. He now came to what he understood better, namely, the working of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Division. And, first, with regard to sittings *in Banc*, he had to say that there were, practically speaking, no arrears. He did not mean that there might not be some few cases standing over, but practically there were no arrears at all. Therefore, as far as regarded two very important portions of the High Court of Justice, the work had been done to a greater extent than he believed had ever been done before. He quite admitted that in trial by jury cases there were very considerable arrears. He had to say, however, that as to this matter there had been gross exaggeration. The fact of the exaggeration was unquestionable. There was no kind of use in disputing about the facts. He did not invent these statements, but he desired their lordships to know the facts in order that they might see how far the amendments made in the Bill were really well founded. The question was one of figures, and his authorities for the figures he had given on a previous occasion and was about to give were the associates of the courts—Mr. Campbell, Mr. Erle, and Mr. Pollock. He said then and now repeated a statement which he saw was questioned elsewhere—that, whereas between November, 1874, and November, 1875, the judges sat 540 days in London and Middlesex to try cases, they sat for 676 days from November, 1875, up to the close of the sittings in 1876. Some doubt had been cast upon his meaning in the use of the expression "judicial days." What he meant was, of course, that if two judges each sat thirty days the result was sixty judicial days; and he repeated that there had been 150 or thereabouts more days spent by the same number of judges in the same time since the passing of the Judicature Acts compared with the number of days' sittings by the same judges in the same time and upon the same work before the passing of the Acts. Further, he stated, and now repeated, that in the words of the return furnished to him, "Every action which has been entered for trial since the Judicature Acts came into operation has been tried within three months of its entry, and every action now left untied since the beginning of the long vacation will have been standing for trial less than three months." In his statement he made no distinction between common jury and special jury cases; it applied unreservedly to both classes. He did not mean to say that three months was no time to wait, or that the arrear was not a large arrear, but he did say that to talk of the Acts having broken down, of the state of things being unprecedented, was to indulge in extravagant language and to go altogether beyond what the facts of the case, as he believed them to be, warranted. Nobody could foretell what would happen hereafter, but as they began last year with 549 cases, and as they would begin the next year with 600 or 700, it was not unlikely

that by the end of the year the arrear would be got rid of. It was alleged, first, that the business was shown to be declining, and yet that more time was taken to try fewer cases, which was said to prove the bad working of the system; and, secondly, it was said that the sittings of the judges had neither been so continuous nor so long as they ought to have been. Now, it was almost a universal rule that as you amended procedure and made it more reasonable and expeditious, you diminished the quantity, but increased the quality of the business that was left. It was wholly fallacious to go back a good many years and say there were then more writs issued and a larger number of cases tried. This was true, but those were days when a large number of cases were undefended, when a number of small technical questions arose for decision, and when the parties, by interlocutory and discoveries, did not know each other's hands as they did now. A larger number of such cases might be tried in the same period; they did not occupy the same amount of judicial time. But now almost every case coming before the judge and jury was a substantial case. By proceedings in chambers and otherwise the chaff was winnowed away, the case on both sides was ascertained and understood, and when the parties came into court it was upon a substantial issue. Under one of the most useful provisions of the Judicature Act it was ordered that a defendant should swear to his defence; he could no longer keep the plaintiff at arm's length, but was put to his oath. Then, again, he understood that a large portion of business which, before the Judicature Act, would come into court, was now disposed of in chambers, and did not figure in the returns of cases. But it was business done all the same, and in any fair and candid comparison of systems it must be taken into account as business now done in one way while before the Judicature Act it was disposed of in another way. He ventured to say, therefore, that the amount of litigious business before the judges was not, substantially at all events, smaller at the present moment than in previous years. The judges, he thought, had good ground to complain of observations made upon them elsewhere, as though they had not been loyal to the spirit of the Act, and, instead of doing their best to carry it into effect, had been obstructive, and prevented the proper working of the Act. He was certain that this sort of attack upon the judges would receive no countenance from his noble and learned friend the Lord Chancellor, who had said no more than was just—though it was generously and kindly said—in moving the second reading of this Bill—namely, that the judges, so far from obstructing the operation of the Act, had accepted it loyally, and with ardour and energy. A more unfair and unfounded accusation than to say that they had in any way obstructed the fair working of the Act was never made by any man in any place, however considerable the man, and however high the place. It was absolutely unfounded. In January and February so much had the work diminished that a judge might occasionally not have been sitting. But speaking for himself and all the judges he knew, and excepting the short statutory vacations, there had been no judge who had not in some place or in some court been sitting day by day from November 2, 1875, up to the present time. So far as his own court was concerned, he maintained that the working of the High Court had, upon the whole, been successful. He did not say he should not have much preferred to state that there were no arrears in the *Nisi Prius* court, but he did assert that if what he had stated to their lordships was anything like the truth, the exaggerated statements on the subject must be attributable in a great degree to the circumstance that sufficient attention had not been paid to the figures and facts before those statements were made. He came, in the next place, to the working of the Court of Appeal, which was, in his opinion, a question somewhat different from the working of the High Court. His noble and learned friend on the woolsack had been so kind furnish him with a return as to the working of the Court as to of Appeal in regard to appeals from the different divisions of the High Court, and he found that for a period of five years, commencing in 1871, the number of appeals from the common law divisions was 245, whereas the number from the Vice-Chancellors' courts was 1,012. During portions of that time up to the passing of the Judicature Act there were, he admitted, many matters in which the decisions of the courts of common law were

final, and that many of the appeals from the Vice-Chancellors' courts were with reference to small matters, so that it was exceedingly difficult to say what deduction ought to be made in making the contrast upon those two grounds. Still there remained the fact of the three common law courts sitting *in Banc* for five years with only 245 appeals, while there were 1,012 during the same time from the courts of the Vice-Chancellors. His noble and learned friend had also been good enough to furnish him with a return with respect to the Court of Appeal for the present year, which included the appeals from the chancery as well as from the common law divisions. From that return it appeared that the number of appeals from the Chancery Division was 200, from the Queen's Bench Division 36, from the Divisional Court of Appeal 3, from the Common Pleas 27, from the Exchequer 45, from the Probate and Divorce Division 18, or in all 129. So that there were 200 appeals from the Chancery Division as against 129 from all the other divisions. Those were facts which did not at tend to encourage, in his opinion, the idea that the business of the courts would diminish under the change which was proposed.

General Correspondence.

CERTIFICATE DUTY.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Mr. Royle's letter in your last number advocating the abolition of this duty quotes some recent public observations of mine on the singular disunity of the solicitor part of the profession, and I will therefore ask you to permit me to say a few words on the subject.

Although the debate giving rise to my comments had no direct relation to this fiscal question—I was opposing the left-handed movement for an increase of our nominal fee of 6s. 8d. to 10s.—there is no point to which my argument applies more forcibly than to the case raised by Mr. Royle.

With solicitors the *laissez aller* principle is more marked than in any other profession or calling. Not one in a dozen takes the slightest active interest in parliamentary debates on Bills affecting almost his very professional existence, the plan being to wait till the Bills become law, indulge in useless murmurs for a short time, and then subside into a meek acceptance of things as they are.

The apathy evinced by solicitors on many subjects materially affecting their interests is perfectly astounding. In private the points are freely enough canvassed, but once attempt to get united action and you may rest assured that nothing whatever will come of it. Apart from a considerable experience in practice, I speak from an intimate personal acquaintance with a large number of London solicitors. It is constantly said that "somebody" ought to do this or that, but when the time comes for concerted action and real support all resolution melts away like the fiery ardour of an angry creditor at a first meeting, who subsequently calms down to absolute insignificance.

It is somewhat remarkable that at any time town solicitors should have been called upon to pay more than the provincial (having regard to the increased expense of London offices and the higher salaries of clerks), but nowadays, when district registries are gradually shattering most of the agencies, there cannot be the slightest pretence for maintaining the town stamp of fifty per cent. more than the country.

Many of us are too apt to view this question as one merely of a few pounds more or less, entirely ignoring the principle—to say nothing of the hardship it inflicts upon some of our less prosperous brethren—and it is my opinion that if the certificate duty is not abolished until the solicitors rise *en masse* to resist it (as any other set of people would do) there will be no change this side of the twentieth century.

FRANCIS K. MUNTON.

City, Aug. 9.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. GEORGE BAILEY, solicitor, has been elected Town Clerk of the newly-incorporated Borough of Luton. Mr. Bailey was admitted a solicitor in Hilary Term, 1851, and was clerk to the Luton Local Board of Health for twenty-five years. The local board is merged in the town council. Mr. Bailey's appointment was confirmed and finally settled on August 1 by the town council.

Mr. ERNEST BARCLAY, solicitor, of Madras, has been appointed Government Solicitor for the Madras Presidency, in the place of his partner, the late Mr. Henry George Prichard.

Mr. TOKE HARVEY BOYS, solicitor, of Margate, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the County of Kent.

Mr. JOHN C. BRAY, barrister, has been appointed Attorney-General of the Colony of South Australia in the new Administration.

Mr. WILLIAM GOLD BUCHANAN, solicitor (of the firm of Frankish & Buchanan), of 23, Parliament-street, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. WILLIAM CROSS, solicitor (of the firm of Goy & Cross), of Burton-on-Humber, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the High Court of Judicature.

Mr. SAMUEL WALKER GRIFFITHS, barrister, has been appointed Attorney-General of the Colony of Queensland in the new Administration. Mr. Griffiths was called to the bar at Brisbane in 1867, and has previously held office as Attorney-General.

Mr. HENRY BLAKE MILLER, solicitor (of the firm of Miller, S. & Stevens), of Norwich, has been elected Town Clerk of that City (at a salary of £1,300 per annum), in succession to Mr. Wace Lockett Medham, deceased. Mr. Miller is the son of the late Mr. Henry Miller, solicitor. He was admitted a solicitor in 1846, and for many years acted as deputy judge of the Guildhall Court. He was formerly clerk to the Norwich Local Board of Health, and since the dissolution of that body he has held the office of sanitary clerk to the corporation.

Mr. AUGUSTUS KEPPEL STEPHENSON, Solicitor to the Treasury, has been appointed Her Majesty's Procurator in all Causes and Matters Maritime, Foreign, Civil, and Ecclesiastical, in the place of the late Mr. Francis Hart Dyke. Mr. Stephenson is the son of Sir William Henry Stephenson, K.C.B., Chief Commissioner of Inland Revenue. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1852. He formerly practised on the Northern Circuit, and was for four years Recorder of Bedford. Mr. Stephenson was appointed assistant-solicitor to the Treasury in 1866, and he was also Registrar of Friendly Societies. He succeeded the late Mr. John Gray, Q.C., as principal solicitor to the Treasury about a year ago.

Mr. JAMES SEWELL WHITE, barrister, has been appointed a judge of the High Court of Judicature at Calcutta, in the place of Mr. John Budd Phear, who has resigned. Mr. White was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1849. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1852, and formerly practised on the Norfolk Circuit, and he was for several years Advocate-General for the Bombay Presidency.

Mr. CHARLES DAVIS ANDREWS, solicitor, of Leominster and Tenbury, has been appointed Honorary Secretary to the Grange Committee at Leominster.

Farror Herschell, Esq., Q.C., M.P., has accepted the presidency of the Jurisprudence department, and T. B. L. Baker, Esq., the chairmanship of the Repression of Crime section, at the forthcoming Liverpool Social Science Congress.

Obituary.

MR. SERJEANT MILLER.

Mr. Robert Miller, serjeant-at-law, and judge of county courts, died at his residence, 31, Leinster-square, on the 5th inst. The deceased was the son of the late Mr. John C. Miller, of Mountjoy-square, Dublin. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1826. He joined the Midland Circuit, practising also on the Northamptonshire and Warwickshire Sessions and at the Central Criminal Court. In 1850 he was created a serjeant-at-law, and for many years he shared with the present Mr. Justice Mellor and the late Mr. Kenneth Macaulay the leading business of his circuit. In January, 1865, Mr. Serjeant Miller was selected by Lord Westbury to be judge of county courts for circuit No. 20. The circuit was afterwards enlarged and at the time of his death his jurisdiction included the whole of Leicestershire and Rutlandshire, as well as Bournemouth, Grantham, Stamford, and Nuneaton. He proved a most efficient and industrious judge, and was highly respected in his district. Mr. Serjeant Miller had been for several years a widower, but he leaves a large family. His eldest son, the late Mr. Robert Byron Miller, formerly of the Home Circuit, was for some time Attorney-General of Tasmania. Another son, Mr. Charles Miller, late of the Midland Circuit, is a police magistrate and coroner at Calcutta, and another son, Mr. Albert Birmingham Miller, late of the Northern Circuit, is official assignee of the Insolvent Debtors' Court at Calcutta.

MR. PERCIVAL ANDREE PICKERING, Q.C.

Mr. Percival Andree Pickering, Q.C., Attorney-General for the County Palatine of Lancaster, and judge of the Court of Passage at Liverpool, died suddenly at Dover on Monday last, while taking a carriage drive. The deceased was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1832 and M.A. in 1835. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1838, when he joined the Northern Circuit and the West Riding of Yorkshire Sessions. He was the author of a work on "The Law as to Treating at Elections," and he was for several years Recorder of Pontefract. Mr. Pickering received a silk gown from Lord Cranworth in 1855. He formerly practised at the parliamentary bar, and at the time of his death he was (in right of seniority) the leader of his circuit, but he had to a great extent relinquished private practice. In 1867, on the death of Mr. Edward James, Q.C., he was elected by the Liverpool Town Council to the office of judge of the Passage Court in that borough, and a few months later he succeeded the late Mr. Stephen Temple, Q.C., as Attorney-General for the County Palatine of Lancashire. Mr. Pickering was a bencher of the Inner Temple, and was treasurer of that society in 1870.

MR. JOSEPH HOWELL BLOOD.

Mr. Joseph Howell Blood, solicitor, of Witham, died on the 5th inst., in his seventieth year. Mr. Blood was born in 1807, was admitted a solicitor in 1837, and had practised in Witham for over thirty-five years. He had a very large private practice, being solicitor to Sir Charles Duncane and to many other large landowners in the neighbourhood. He was for many years in partnership with the late Mr. Charles Douglas, and more recently with his son, Mr. William Bindon Blood, who was admitted in 1865. Mr. Blood was a perpetual commissioner for Essex, and after having been for a long time deputy treasurer for the eastern division of the county he was a few years ago appointed treasurer for the division. He was also clerk to the magistrates and Commissioners of Income-tax for the Witham division, clerk to the Witham Board of Guardians and Local Board of Health, and superintendent-registrar. His politics were Conservative, and he had fought many contests for his party.

MR. CHARLES JAMES GALE.

Mr. Charles James Gale, many years a judge of county courts, died at his residence, Kitnocks, near Botley, Hampshire, on the 5th inst., at the age of seventy-two. Mr. Gale was the son of the late Mr. Charles Gale, and was born in 1804. He was educated at the Springingham Grammar School, and in Trinity Term, 1832, he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple. He practised on the Midland Circuit, and had several years' experience as a reporter, being author of two volumes of Gale's Exchequer Reports, and of three volumes of Gale and Davidson's Queen's Bench Reports; but his reputation as a lawyer was established by his well-known book on "Easements," which first appeared in 1839, and has gone through several editions. On the passing of the County Court Act Mr. Gale was selected as judge for circuit No. 51, comprising the whole of Hampshire. His judicial career fully justified his previous reputation; he evinced a sound knowledge of law, and great tact and judgment in the discharge of the business. He was very highly respected by the solicitors who practised before him, and his decisions were rarely reversed on appeal. In September, 1874, after twenty-seven years' service, the state of his health obliged him to retire on a pension. Mr. Gale was a magistrate for Hampshire.

MR. CHARLES RIVINGTON.

Mr. Charles Rivington, solicitor, of 1, Fenchurch-buildings, died very suddenly at his residence at Denmark-hill, on the 4th inst., in his seventieth year. The deceased was the son of the late Mr. Henry Rivington, solicitor, and was born in 1807. He was admitted a solicitor in 1823, and shortly afterwards succeeded to his father's practice. He was a commissioner for affidavits in all the divisions of the High Court, and a perpetual commissioner for London, Westminster, and Middlesex. He had a good private practice, and he was ward clerk for the wards of Lime-street and Aldgate. He had also been for several years vestry clerk of the parishes of St. Andrew Undershaft, St. Katharine Cree, and St. Katharine Coleman, and a short time ago his son and partner, Mr. Charles Robert Rivington (who was admitted a solicitor in 1869), was associated with him in these offices. On his father's death Mr. Rivington became clerk to the Stationers' Company. He took a very warm interest in the affairs of that body; on his resignation of the clerkship he was elected one of the court assistants, and after serving several intermediate offices, he had only lately been elected master of the company for the current year. As recently as the Saturday before his death he had presided at the distribution of prizes for the Stationers' School.

"Lex" writes to the *Times*:—"The fact is that the Judicature Act has largely increased the volume of litigation. It has made the entry into law cheap and simple, and, 'being in,' it is the tendency of every litigant to 'bear it that the opposed may beware of him.' But while the mass of litigation is largely increased, the process of actual trial or hearing has in the most important division of the court—the chancery—been rendered much more slow, and, I fear, not more sure, by the introduction of oral evidence. Thus the judges of that division, while having more work thrown on them, are at the same time rendered less able to cope with that which they have. At the same time the increase of litigation has increased the duties of the common law divisions. Thus each division is overburdened, the chancery doubly so. And yet in the latter the number of judges—four as against the common law eighteen—remains unaltered. The judges may, in November, decide the point of practice as they see fit, but neither they nor any other human power can render four men capable of doing the work of six or seven. The plain and simple fact is that things are at a dead-lock and will remain so unless and until the judicial staff in chancery is increased. Six or seven judges—i.e., two or three additional judges—at the least are required to meet the pressure on that division."

Legal News.

Mr. Justice Phear has resigned his seat as a judge of the High Court at Calcutta, after holding the office for twelve years. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1854, and formerly practised on the Norfolk Circuit.

Lord Redesdale has given notice of his intention to move that, until the House do make further orders in accordance with the report of the Select Committee on Parliamentary Agency, certain rules be observed by the officers of the House and by all parliamentary agents and solicitors engaged in prosecuting proceedings in the House of Lords upon any petition or Bill; and the Lord President will move that the chairman of committees be authorized to enforce all the rules and orders of the House in relation to the conduct of the private business of the House, and to the agents and solicitors engaged in prosecuting the same during any prorogation of Parliament.

On Monday last, in the House of Commons, in reply to Sir G. Bowyer, Sir C. Adderley said that the legal arrangements which have been made at the Board of Trade consist in the appointment of a solicitor to the Board of Trade, and his staff is in course of formation. The only description of Board of Trade legal business which will continue to be done by the solicitor to the Customs as heretofore is that portion of the business relating to the registry of ships which is transacted through the officers of Customs at the outports and in London, and which has not yet been transferred by statute to the Board of Trade.

A petition was presented by Mr. Marten, Q.C., M.P., to the House of Commons on Monday from the Society for Promoting the Amendment of the Law, stating that it is proposed to transfer three judges from the common law divisions of the High Court to the Court of Appeal, and to abandon the fluctuating element of that court preserved, in analogy to the Court of Exchequer Chamber, by the Judicature Act, 1875; that the desired end would be equally attained by the transfer of two of such judges to that court; and that the presence there of a fourth ordinary judge taken from the common law bar is not necessary for the efficiency of the court, and not sufficient to enable it to form two effective divisions without the assistance either of the Lord Chancellor or of the Master of the Rolls, and that if the third judge proposed to be taken from the common law divisions were transferred to the Chancery Division, instead of to the Court of Appeal, such transfer would go far to remove the evil complained of.

The *Central Law Journal* says that an application was recently made in the New York Supreme Court by the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents (which is, under a special Act, entitled to all theatrical, &c., licence fees), to compel Mrs. Annie Eva Fay, who advertises *séances* as a spiritual medium, to take out a juggler's licence. Mrs. Fay replied with affidavits controverting those of the complainants, and asserting that there was no human agency in the manifestations. The plaintiffs represented Mrs. Fay to be a professional juggler. Judge Donohue last week rendered a decision in the matter. He says: "While the court should be careful in any attempt to restrain parties claiming to be in pursuit of knowledge or the exercise of religious rules, the court should be equally careful not to permit the mere name of medium to sustain an exhibition that the statute contemplates should pay a licence. It seems to me, after careful consideration of the case, that the defendant comes within the statute, and must be restrained."

At an adjourned inquest before Mr. Payne a singular difficulty arose. After the adjournment the required witnesses and others were forthcoming, but Mr. Oxenham, the foreman, was missing. It was ascertained that he had been convicted and was awaiting his sentence for stealing a bill of exchange. Unfortunately, only 11 jurymen were left, and another adjournment was therefore necessary to endeavour to procure the attendance of the foreman by a *habeas corpus*. On Thursday the coroner stated that he found himself in a very peculiar difficulty, as he was unable to get Mr. Oxenham there. An inquest was illegal unless twelve men sat upon it. He could not swear in

another man in Mr. Oxenham's place because the body had been buried. Had this not happened he would have sworn another man. Knowing from evidence that he had, although he could not call it, that there was no suspicion of foul play, there was no pretext for exhuming the body. He therefore wrote to Mr. Cross asking for an order upon which Mr. Oxenham might be brought up, so that the inquiry might be concluded. In reply, he received a letter from the Home Secretary stating that he had no power to make the required order. He was now, therefore, perfectly powerless in the matter. He did not know of any such case. He doubted, if he could have got Mr. Oxenham there, whether he would have been a good and lawful man within the meaning of the statute. As the Home Secretary could not assist them, nothing could be done, and therefore, thanking the gentlemen of the jury for the kind attention they had given him, he had no alternative but to discharge them.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Aug. 3.—GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY.
This Bill was read a third time and passed.

WINTER ASSIZES.

This Bill passed through committee.

PAROCHIAL RECORDS.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.

This Bill was read a second time.

Aug. 7.—CATTLE DISEASE (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

SAVINGS BANKS (BARRISTER).

This Bill was read a second time.

SUPERANNUATION (UNHEALTHY CLIMATES).

This Bill was read a second time.

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO.

This Bill was read a second time.

JURIES PROCEDURE (IRELAND).

This Bill passed through committee.

POOR LAW RATING (IRELAND).

This Bill passed through committee.

ERNE LOUGH AND RIVER.

This Bill was read a second time.

ARDGLASS HARBOUR.

This Bill was read a second time.

WINTER ASSIZES.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

This Bill was read a first time.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.

This Bill was read a first time.

Aug. 8.—METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (LOANS).

This Bill was read a second time.

EXHAUSTED PARISH LANDS.

This Bill passed through committee.

TRALEE SAVINGS BANK.

This Bill was read a second time.

CATTLE DISEASE (IRELAND).

This Bill passed through committee.

SAVINGS BANKS (BARRISTER).

This Bill passed through committee.

SUPERANNUATION (UNHEALTHY CLIMATES).

This Bill passed through committee.

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO.

This Bill passed through committee.

POOR LAW RATING (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

This Bill was read a second time.

Aug. 9.—ERNE LOUGH AND RIVER.

This Bill passed through committee.

ARDGLASS HARBOUR.

This Bill passed through committee.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (LOANS).

This Bill passed through committee.

TRALEE SAVINGS BANK.

This Bill passed through committee.

SAVINGS BANKS (BARRISTER).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION (UNHEALTHY CLIMATES).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

BISHOPRIC OF TRURO.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

JURIES PROCEDURE (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Aug. 3.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The Marquis of HARTINGTON moved "That, in the opinion of this House, principles have been introduced into the Bill since its second reading which were not then either mentioned or contemplated by the House, which tend to disturb the basis on which elementary education now rests, to impede the formation of new schools, to introduce discord and confusion into the election of School Boards, and to place the management of schools in the hands of persons who neither contribute to their support nor are elected by the ratepayers."—On a division the motion was rejected by 282 to 120.

Lord SANDON moved to insert a new clause providing that registrars of births and deaths shall, when required, make returns to the School Board.—The clause was agreed to and added to the Bill.

Lord SANDON moved to insert a new clause giving to the officer of the local authority power, when authorized to do so by a justice of the peace, to enter places of employment where he thought the Act was not being carried out.—This clause was agreed to and added to the Bill.

Mr. M'LAREN moved, page 20, after clause 48, to insert the following clause:—"In the application of this Act to Scotland the following provision shall have effect; the words 'so much of section 97 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, as enacts,' shall be construed as if the words were 'the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, and the parliamentary grants made under the same, by minutes of the Scotch Education Department in force for the time as enact;' and that clause 47, as thus varied and interpreted, shall apply to Scotland."—The clause was read a second time and added to the Bill.

Mr. BOORD moved the following clause:—"No legal proceedings for non-attendance, or irregular attendance at school, shall be commenced in a court of summary jurisdiction by any person appointed to carry out the compulsory bye-laws of a School Board or local authority, except by the direction of not less than two members of a School Board, school attendance committee, or local committee, who shall have previously investigated the circumstances under which it is proposed to take such action."—Lord SANDON said it would be necessary to insert the word "or" before "school attendance committee," and then let the clause stop there.—The clause, amended as suggested, was agreed to and added to the Bill.

Mr. SHAW-LEFEVRE proposed a clause providing for the preparation of annual accounts of receipts and expenditure by the managers of schools in receipt of the parliamentary grant, and that such accounts should be open to public inspection.—On a division the clause was rejected by 82 to 67.

Mr. READ moved in clause 5 to insert words enabling a child to go to work at the age of nine and a half if it had completed the number of school attendances, and obtained a certificate, fixed by standard four of the Code of 1876.—The amendment was withdrawn.—An amendment, proposed by Lord F. CAVENDISH, to the effect that the excuse with respect to attendance contained in the clause should not be made to apply to canal children, was, after an as-

surance from Mr. CROSS that the condition of those children would be dealt with next year, withdrawn.

Lord R. MONTAGU moved to insert the following new clause:—"If the parent of any child who is resident in the district of a School Board is unable, by reason of poverty, to pay the fees of such child at a public elementary school, or any part of such fee, and if the School Board fails to make regulations, under clauses 25 and 74 of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, for the payment of the same, it shall be the duty of the guardians, if satisfied of such inability, to pay the same in accordance with the provisions of this section."

The debate was adjourned.

Aug. 4.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The adjourned debate on the further consideration of this Bill, as amended was resumed.

Lord R. MONTAGU withdrew his amendment.—Mr. FORSTER moved an amendment making it clearer that the amendment does not apply to pauper children, which was agreed to without a division.

Lord SANDON moved in clause 14, page 6, line 10, the omission of the words, "not being resident in the district of a School Board."—On a division the amendment was carried by 175 to 77.—Mr. FAWCETT moved to amend clause 14 in relation to the payment of the fee by the guardians by omitting the words "it shall be the duty of," in order to insert words providing that the guardians may pay it if they think fit.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 176 to 72.—Mr. BRISTOWS proposed the insertion of words to provide that the payment of school fees by boards of guardians should be subject to regulations approved from time to time by the Education Department.—The amendment was withdrawn.—Mr. RAMSAY proposed the insertion of words which would have the effect of depriving persons whose children were educated by means of grants from Boards of the power to vote in elections.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 159 to 42.—Mr. W. E. FORSTER proposed to add to clause 14 the words, "The 25th section of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, is hereby repealed."—The amendment was agreed to, and the words for the repeal of section 25 in the Act of 1870 were then added to the clause.

Lord SANDON moved, in clause 15, to insert a better definition of a day industrial school as follows:—"A school in which industrial training, elementary education, and one or more meals a day, but not lodging, are provided for the children."—The amendment was agreed to.—On clause 15, Lord SANDON moved to amend the clause by inserting words giving the Secretary of State power to make and to revoke and vary the forms of orders for sending children to day industrial schools, and if he should be of opinion that from a change of circumstances a day industrial school had ceased to be necessary in the neighbourhood, to withdraw the certificate of the school.—The amendment was agreed to, as was also another proposed by Lord SANDON on clause 16, to leave out the words "shall conform to the standards," and insert "to be recommended by the Secretary of State shall provide for the examination of the children according to the standards of proficiency."

Lord SANDON moved an amendment in clause 25, with regard to the time at which a motion might be made for the dissolution of a School Board. He proposed that "six months before the date of the election should be substituted for 'three months, as the maximum limit."—The amendment was agreed to.

The remaining amendments were agreed to.

POLLUTION OF RIVERS.

This Bill was read a third time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (BIRMINGHAM).

This Bill passed through committee.

PRISONS.

This Bill was committed *pro forma*, and certain amendments were introduced into it in accordance with the intimation which was made on the part of the Government a few days ago.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE.

This Bill was read a second time.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

This Bill was read a second time.

Aug. 5.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

On a division this Bill was read a third time by 119 to 46, and was passed.

SUEZ CANAL SHARES.

This Bill was read a second time.

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT (DUBLIN).

This Bill went through committee.

CHAIRMAN OF QUARTER SESSIONS (IRELAND).

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL for Ireland introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to the jurisdiction of chairmen of quarter sessions in Ireland.

Aug. 7.—APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

The House went into committee on this Bill.

On clause 6, Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved in page 2, line 33, to omit all the words after "shall" down to "longer" in the following line, the effect of the amendment being that a peer once created a lord of appeal should still remain entitled to sit and vote in the House of Lords even though he had ceased to act as lord of appeal.—On a division the amendment was negatived by 107 to 30.—Mr. BERESFORD HOPE (in the absence of Mr. Heygate) moved an amendment to the effect that nothing in the Order of Council of the 20th of February, 1827, or in any other Order in Council, rule, or practice of the Privy Council, or of the Judicial Committee, should for the future be construed to prevent any member or members of the Judicial Committee, when sitting at the hearing of any appeal or petition, from delivering his or their separate opinion or judgment as to the report which should be made to her Majesty upon the said appeal or petition.—The amendment was negatived.

On clause 7 Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS said that an amendment would be necessary in order to enable lords of appeal who might be appointed after the prorogation and before the next sitting of Parliament to be able to take their seats and be sworn in. He therefore proposed after the word "therewith," clause 7, page 3, line 32, to insert "and for the purpose of lords of appeal taking their seats and the oaths."—The amendment was agreed to.—Clause 7, as amended, was then ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 8, Sir G. BOWYER said that the clause authorized the Lords of Appeal to sit during a dissolution. He moved the substitution of the words "House of Lords" for Lords of Appeal.—The amendment was withdrawn.—Mr. CHARLEY moved the rejection of the clause.—The amendment was negatived.

Clauses 10 and 11 (as amended) were added to the Bill.—Mr. BERESFORD HOPE moved the omission of the words which allow archbishops and bishops to act as assessors in ecclesiastical cases.—On a division the numbers were equal, but the CHAIRMAN said that, as the House would have an opportunity of again considering the question, he would give his vote against the amendment.

Clause 14 was omitted from the Bill.

Clauses 15 to 17, inclusive, were agreed to, and progress was reported.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT.

The Lords' amendments to this Bill were agreed to.

POLICE EXPENSES ACT (CONTINUANCE).

This Bill was read a third time.

COMMONS.

The Lords' amendments on this Bill were agreed to.

PRISONS (IRELAND).

This Bill was withdrawn.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

This Bill passed through committee.

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT (DUBLIN).

This Bill was read a third time.

FORFEITURE RELIEF.

This Bill was read a third time.

PAROCHIAL RECORDS.

This Bill was read a second time.

COMPANIES ACTS (1862 AND 1867) AMENDMENT.

The House went into committee on this Bill, but progress was immediately reported.

MUNICIPAL PRIVILEGES (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a third time.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS.

The House went into committee on this Bill, but progress was immediately reported.

Aug. 8.—CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION).

This Bill was read a second time.

SUEZ CANAL SHARES.

This Bill passed through committee.

WAR DEPARTMENT, &c.

This Bill passed through committee.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

The House went into committee on this Bill, and proceeded to consider the new clauses proposed by the Attorney-General in page 6, after line 5.—Mr. CHARLEY moved to leave out, in lines 11, 12, and 13, "and the vacancies so created in the High Court of Justice shall not be filled up, except in the event and to the extent herein-after mentioned."—The CHAIRMAN, in putting the question, observed that Mr. Gregory had an amendment to propose in line 11, which must precede that of the hon. and learned member for Salford.—Mr. GREGORY proposed to leave it optional to take the judges for the Court of Appeal from the High Court, instead of making it compulsory, by substituting the word "may" for the word "shall."

The amendments were withdrawn.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved a clause to the effect that every action in the High Court of Justice should "as far as is practicable and convenient" be heard and disposed of by a single judge, and that all proceedings subsequent to the hearing or trial, and down to and including the final judgment or order, always excepting proceedings on appeal, should be "as far as is practicable and convenient" be had and taken before the judge before whom the trial or hearing of the action occurred.—Mr. GREGORY proposed to amend the clause by omitting the words "as far as is practicable and convenient."—After some conversation the amendment was negatived.

Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS moved that the clause which provided that the Lord Chancellor and the other judges should frame the rules and orders under the Bill should be amended, so as to delegate that duty to the Lord Chancellor and a smaller number of the judges than the entire body.—Mr. WHALLEY supported the clause.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had carefully considered the amendment of his hon. and learned friend the member for Denbigh, and he must say he considered it an improvement.—The clause, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL proposed a new clause to give power in certain events to fill vacancies occasioned in the High Court of Justice by the removal of judges to the Court of Appeal.—The clause was added to the Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL next proposed a clause for the appointment of assessors to the Judicial Committee.—The clause was agreed to, as was also a clause extending the time for arrangements to be made by the Lord Chancellor under the Act of 1873 in the case of vacancies occurring.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL proposed a clause enabling district registrars to appoint deputies.—On a division the clause was carried by 68 to 42.—The clause was then amended by the insertion of words providing that in each case the appointment of a deputy by the registrar should be with the approval of the Lord Chancellor, and limiting all such appointments to three months.—As thus amended the clause was added to the Bill.

Other new clauses were added to the Bill, which passed through committee.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (ARTISANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS).
This Bill passed through committee.

CROSSED CHEQUES.

This Bill, as amended, was considered.

BILLBOROUGH, BIRMINGHAM, AND BATH PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION.

This Bill was read a third time.

COMPANIES ACTS (1862 AND 1867) AMENDMENT.

This Bill passed through committee.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS.

This Bill passed through committee.

ELECTIONS.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL introduced a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to election petitions, and the inquiry into and prevention of corrupt practices at parliamentary elections.

Aug. 9.—APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

This Bill, as amended, was considered.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD moved a new clause to provide that "in any cause tried at the assizes, an application for a new trial, or to set aside the verdict or judgment, or to enter any other verdict or judgment, may be made within the first four days of the sittings of the High Court of Justice in Middlesex next after the trial."—The clause was withdrawn.

Sir C. O'LOGHLEN moved an amendment to provide that what was done by the Lords of Appeal should be done "in the name of the House of Lords."—The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE moved the omission from the 13th clause of the words relating to the appointment of episcopal assessors of the Judicial Committee, contending that the court ought to be a lay court and deal only with questions of law, and that it ought to be left a tribunal of the same character as was constituted under the Public Worship Regulation Act.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 55 to 42.

The clause increasing the allowance to retired Indian and colonial judges attending the Privy Council was negatived. The Bill was read a third time and passed.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

This Bill was read a second time.

NORWICH AND BOSTON (CORRUPT VOTERS).

This Bill was read a second time.

CHAIRMAN'S JURISDICTION (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

PAROCHIAL RECORDS.

This Bill was read a third time.

COMPANIES ACTS (1862 AND 1867) AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a third time.

SUEZ CANAL SHARES.

This Bill was read a third time.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS.

This Bill was read a third time.

BOW-STREET POLICE-COURT (SITE).

This Bill passed through committee.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND)

This Bill was withdrawn.

PRISONS.

This Bill was withdrawn.

Courts.

LIVERPOOL ASSIZES.

(Before LINDLEY, J.)

Aug. 9. — *Redmayne v. Vaughan*.

Trial of chancery action at assizes.

This was an action brought in the Liverpool district registry and marked for the Chancery Division—Vice-Chancellor Bacon—for dissolution of partnership in a brewing firm of Redmayne & Vaughan at Ormskirk. The plaintiff claimed in his statement of claim to have the action tried at the Liverpool Assizes, and Vice-Chancellor Bacon, when the pleadings were closed, made an order to that effect [see *ante*, p. 774]. The associate doubted whether he should enter chancery cases for trial, but Mr. Baron Bramwell, on being applied to on circuit, directed him to do so. The case accordingly now came on for hearing.

W. C. Gully and *R. Neville* (of the chancery bar), were for the plaintiff.

J. B. Aspinall, Q.C., and *Potter*, for the defendant.

By agreement a jury was dispensed with.

The plaintiff and another witness were examined on his behalf, and Mr. Greenway, the defendant's solicitor, gave evidence on behalf of the defendant as to what passed at a particular interview.

LINDLEY, J., decreed a dissolution of the firm as prayed; receiver to be continued; that the accounts should be referred to the district registrar, with a direction to debit the defendant with £1,600 capital, which he should have contributed, but did not. His lordship also gave several subsidiary directions as to dealing with certain assets of the late firm, and condemned the defendant in the costs of the special defence set up by him. Liberty for either party to apply.

Law Students' Journal.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

MICHAELMAS COURSE OF LECTURES, 1876.

Days and Hours appointed for the Delivery of the Public Lectures by the Professors.

Constitutional Law and Legal History: Lectures delivered and classes held in the Middle Temple Hall.—11 a.m. Tuesdays and Thursdays; first lecture, November 2.

Equity: Lectures delivered in the room under the Library at Lincoln's-inn Hall.—4.15 p.m. Wednesdays and Fridays; first lecture, November 3.

The Law of Real and Personal Property: Lectures delivered in Gray's-inn Hall.—4.15 p.m. Tuesdays and Saturdays; first lecture, November 4.

The Common Law: Lectures delivered in the Inner Temple Hall.—4.15 p.m. Mondays and Thursdays; first lecture, November 2.

PROSPECTUS OF THE LECTURES OF THE PROFESSORS.

The Professor of Jurisprudence and Roman Civil Law will during the ensuing educational term deliver twelve public lectures on Constitutional Law and Legal History.

The course will commence on Thursday, November 2, at 11 a.m., and will be continued on Tuesdays and Thursdays at the same hour.

Four lectures will be given to the private class, to commence on Tuesday, November 7, and to be continued on the three following Tuesdays, at 12 o'clock.

EQUITY.

The Professor of Equity will, during the ensuing educational term, continue his public lectures upon the origin, nature, principles, and application of equity, commencing with "Specific Performance."

There will be fourteen lectures during the ensuing educational term, to commence on Friday, November 3, 1876, at 4.15 p.m., and to continue at the same hour on Wednesdays and Fridays during the term.

LAW OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY.

The Professor of the Law of Real and Personal Property will deliver, during the ensuing educational term, twelve public lectures on the subject of Settlements.

First lecture on this subject will be delivered on Saturday, November 4, 1876, at 3.15 p.m.

The subsequent lectures will be delivered on Saturdays at 3.15 p.m., and on Thursdays at 4.15 p.m.

COMMON LAW.

The Professor of Common Law will deliver, during the ensuing educational term, twelve public lectures on Criminal Law.

First lecture on this subject will be delivered on Thursday, November 2, 1876, at 4.15 p.m.

The subsequent lectures will be delivered on Mondays and Thursdays at the same hour.

Note.—In December next there will be four examinations, one in the subject of the lectures given by each professor, open (subject as hereinafter mentioned) to all

students who have during the year attended the lectures of any of the professors, but no student will be admitted to the examination in the subjects of the lectures of any professor unless he shall have attended at least two-thirds of the lectures given during the year by such professor. No student will be admitted to more than two examinations; and no student who shall have obtained a studentship will be admitted to any such examination.

After the examinations the following prizes will, on the recommendation of the committee, be given (that is to say) :—

To the students who shall have passed the best examination in the subjects of the lectures of each professor, first prize, £50; second prize, £25; third prize, £15; fourth prize, £10; and a first and second prize of £70 and £30 respectively to the students who obtain the greatest aggregate number of marks in the examination in the subjects of the lectures given by any two of the professors.

No student will be entitled to more than one prize, but a student will receive the prize of the highest value to which he shall appear to be entitled.

The committee will not be obliged to recommend any of the above prizes to be awarded if the result of the examination be such as, in their opinion, will not justify such recommendation.

Any further information required by students may be obtained on application to the clerk of the council, Lincoln's-inn-hall.

Court Papers.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

NOTICE.

During the vacation until further notice :—All applications which are of an urgent nature are to be made to the Hon. Sir William Ventriss Field, one of the justices of the High Court of Justice.

Mr. Justice Field will sit in the court of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins, at Lincoln's-inn, at eleven a.m. on Tuesday in every week till further notice, for the purpose of hearing such applications.

The necessary papers relating to every such application are to be left with, or addressed (under cover) to, Mr. Gloster, at the registrars' office, Chancery-lane, before one o'clock on the Friday previous to the day on which the application is intended to be made.

Applications for leave to give notice of motion may be made to the chief clerk at the chambers of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins.

No case will be placed upon the paper unless notice has been previously given at the registrars' office.

In any case of great urgency the brief of counsel is to be sent to Mr. Justice Field by book post or parcel, prepaid, accompanied by office copies of the affidavits in support of the application, and also by a minute, on a separate sheet of paper, signed by counsel, of the order he may consider the applicant entitled to, and an envelope capable of receiving the papers, and addressed as follows :—"Chancery Official Letter: To the Registrar in Vacation, Chancery Registrars' Office, Chancery-lane, London, W.C."

On applications for injunctions or writs of *ne exeat regno*, in addition to the above, there must also be sent a copy of the writ and a certificate of writ issued.

The papers sent to Mr. Justice Field will be returned to the registrar.

Mr. Justice Field's address can be obtained on application at the chambers of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins, 3, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn.

The chambers of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins will be open on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in every week, from eleven to one o'clock.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN SWEDEN.

II.

In ordinary civil actions the procedure is very simple. The pursuer applies to the judge, who issues a summons, which must state the name of the pursuer, the nature of the claim, the day when the defender must appear, and the place where he must make his answer, under certification that if he do not appear the case will be decided in his absence. The pursuer must give intimation to the defender by delivering to him the summons, or in some cases a copy of it, in the presence of two credible witnesses; one witness is sufficient where the defender gives an acknowledgment that he has received the summons. Personal intimation may be made everywhere except in church. Where, however, a parish is called as a defender, intimation is made from the pulpit of the parish church on some Sunday in the course of the service. Where the defender is resident within the same district, the pursuer must give him intimation within a certain period, varying with the distance of the defender from the court, and if intimation is not made within the legal time, the summons falls. Where the defender is absent from Sweden, intimation is made by affixing a copy of the summons to the door of the court-house. On the appointed day, both parties must appear in court, unless they can allege some valid excuse, such as illness, employment on official business, or a prior summons to another court, in which case the cause is postponed to the next assizes. If no excuse is given in the parties are fined; and if the pursuer be the defaulter, he is found liable to the defender in the expense occasioned by his absence. Where the defender does not appear after proof of intimation, the judge hears the case, and pronounces judgment, if he think the pursuer has a just claim. The judgment must be intimated by the pursuer to the defender, who may then appeal to the Hofrätt, where he may be allowed to lead evidence, if the court think it necessary. If he do not appeal within the time fixed for appealing (which is mentioned in the judgment), his only resource is to bring an action to have the judgment set aside; but in the meantime the pursuer may proceed with the execution of his decree, provided he give sufficient security for the repayment of the money if the decree be afterwards recalled. If the parties both appear, the jurisdiction of the judge may be declined on any of the following grounds, viz., if he be related to either of the parties within the prohibited degrees, or if he be at open enmity with either of them, or if he or his near relatives have any interest in the suit, or may expect to derive advantage, or to sustain injury directly or indirectly from the result of the litigation, or if he have been judge in the same cause in another court, or have been mandatory or witness, or have, in short, been in any way concerned with the previous stages of the dispute, or if he have himself a like suit waiting for decision. A party who wrongfully challenges a judge is fined; but if the challenge be sustained a substitute is appointed by the Hofrätt, at the cost, in the first instance, of the pursuer, who, however, recovers the amount disbursed by him from the defender in the event of success.

The case then proceeds. In questions of small value the parties are heard orally; in more important causes one written statement is allowed on each side, setting forth shortly, and without ambiguity, the grounds of action and the defence. If the parties desire it, or if the judge think it expedient, a day is fixed for the debating the question or the leading of proof. In the latter case the judge indicates to the parties the nature of the evidence which he will expect them to adduce; but before proof is led objections to the jurisdiction of the court must be disposed of. As a general rule a defender can only be summoned to answer in the court within whose jurisdiction he resides, but several exceptions are made to this rule. In the first place, if a party have raised an action in another district from that in which he resides, he must answer in any counter-action which is brought against him there by his antagonist. Questions of succession, or of the interpretation of wills, or claims for money due by a deceased debtor, must be tried in the court to whose juris-

diction he was subject, and his heirs are cited to that court, even although they live elsewhere. In disputes between buyer and seller, the court within whose jurisdiction the bargain was made can summon a party to appear who is not resident within the district. In this case, however, the defender must be cited while within the district. Questions affecting land are tried in the court within whose district the lands lie, and if they stretch over more than one district, then the court to which the principal estate or house is subject has jurisdiction. Where several parties have granted a joint and several obligation, the creditor sues whichever of the debtors he pleases, at the place of that debtor's residence; but if the obligation be joint, and the validity of the document, or the amount due by each be disputed, the creditor can sue them all in the court to which any one of them is subject. Partners of a company are sued where the partnership has its domicile. Matrimonial causes, again, are tried in the court of the district where the woman resides, but she has the option of suing the man in the court of his ordinary domicile. To this rule, however, there is an exception, that actions founded on desertion are tried where the innocent spouse resides. Jurisdiction cannot be given by consent of parties, but the King may grant permission on the application of the parties to any judge to try the case.

The defender, again, may object that the dispute is one of a class which is appropriated to another court; and this exception must also be at once disposed of. Generally the courts of first instance have jurisdiction in all cases except the following, which have been appropriated to the courts of appeal. In civil cases the exceptions are actions affecting the title of estates belonging to noblemen, or in regard to their wills, or the curatory of their children and heirs, if they too are noble, and also important actions against noblemen. Members of the universities and foreign noblemen have the same privileges. To Svea Hofrätt are appropriated actions against the State Bank, and claims for reward for discovering forged notes. In criminal matters the courts of appeal are alone competent to entertain charges of high treason against the King or the country, of holding communications with the enemy, of attempts on the life of the King or Royal family, as well as all charges of breach of duty against inferior judges or subordinate officials. Blasphemy against God is punished by the courts of appeal on the report of a Håradshöfding, while no capital sentence can be executed until it has been confirmed by the Hofrätt within whose jurisdiction the case has been tried. All exceptions such as those which have been referred to, must be stated by the defender at the outset of the case, and if he be found to have stated and insisted on them for the mere purpose of causing delay he is subjected to a fine proportioned to the importance of the case. While the law is thus strict in regard to unnecessary delay, ample facilities are given to any litigant who *bona fide* desires more time for the preparation of his case.

When the day of trial has arrived, the parties must appear with documentary evidence, or the witnesses whom they propose to examine, and if the witnesses will not come voluntarily, the court issues summonses to compel their attendance, under the penalty of fine or imprisonment. As in some other continental countries, merchants are obliged to keep business books with accuracy, and in the case of bankruptcy are liable to penalties if it be found that they have failed to do. The evidence afforded by regularly kept business books, as required by law, is considered of great weight, and in many cases is of itself decisive. Where witnesses are adduced, they are examined by the judge, who makes a note of the import of their evidence, and before they leave the court fixes the amount of remuneration which they are to receive. The evidence of two concurring witnesses is required; if only one is adduced, that forms a *semiplena probatio*, and the matter may then be referred to the defender's oath. The parties may also be required to take the oath of verity, but on *y* in the Hofrätt.

During the progress of the case a third party may appear, and claim to be heard on the ground that the decision of the question will affect his interests. If he satisfies the judge that he is entitled to appear, the case is stayed to allow him to bring an action, which he must do before the next assizes. Where the parties settle the case before the hearing or the proof comes on, they must without delay inform the court,

and in the event of their failure to do so both pursuer and defender are liable to a fine.

Before pronouncing judgment the Håradshöfding may issue to the parties a written statement of the claim and the evidence, and require them to subscribe it, or state any objections to its accuracy. In the courts of appeal this course is usually followed, but in the courts of first instance the judge only draws up such a statement in cases which he thinks of greater importance.

This statement having been returned by the parties, judgment is pronounced by the Håradshöfding in open court, and a written statement of it handed to the parties. The judgment must specify the time within which an appeal must be taken by the losing party. At the same time the judge may fix the cost payable to the successful suitor, or a separate action may be brought to recover the amount.

Where an appeal is taken, the Håradshöfding must at once make a note on the judgment to that effect, and appoint a day on which both parties must appear before the Hofrätt. The appellant must find security for the costs and injury which may accrue to the respondent from the appeal. If no appeal is taken within the period fixed by the decree, the judgment is final. On the day which has been appointed by the Håradshöfding, the appellant must give in to the Hofrätt a written statement of the grounds of his appeal, which the respondent is allowed to answer. The appeals are distributed by lot among the judges of the Hofrätt, and a written report is drawn up by the judge, or assessor, to whom the appeal is remitted. This report is considered by one of the sections of the court, and judgment is pronounced. The deliberations of the Court of Appeal take place in private, and the parties are not heard orally upon the appeal. From the decisions of the Hofrätt, an appeal lies, as has already been said, to the Högsta Domstol, and the procedure followed is similar to that just described.

In order to prevent the "law's delays" being abused by litigants to their own advantage, fines are imposed on those who litigate merely for the purpose of placing obstacles in the way of the recovery of just debts, but, notwithstanding, these provisions form only a very partial check.

In this account of the proceedings before Swedish courts of law, we have assumed, as the Swedish law assumes, that all the steps are taken by the parties themselves. The strict enforcement of such a rule would of course in many cases lead to the denial of justice, and accordingly litigants are allowed to choose persons to represent them before the courts. A party may name his relation, his servant, or his friend as his representative in any lawsuit, and for that purpose must furnish him with a mandate, provided that the mandatory be a person of intelligence and of fair and respectable character. Generally speaking, also, he must be known to the judge, and obtain his permission to appear. Subject to these qualifications, any Swede may conduct a case on behalf of another; and certain Crown officials, and those who hold university certificates, are entitled to act as mandatories without the special leave of the court. On the other hand, clergymen are not allowed to plead, except in questions concerning themselves, their wives, children, servants, or glebe. No one can plead a case who has had to do with it as judge in another court, or who has held a mandate from the opposite side in the same case, or who is under curatory, or whose father, father-in-law, son or son-in-law, brother or brother-in-law, is judge in the case. No member of the court of appeal, or paid official in it, can hold a mandate before the court of appeal, or any of the inferior courts which are within its jurisdiction, except for a near relation, or cousin-german, or for his ward. No one can conduct a case for another unless he be named in open court, or produce a duly-sealed mandate from his principal, in which the name of the court, the mandatory, and the suit are set forth. Without special authority a mandatory cannot compromise, throw up a case, or follow it to a higher court, and those who have obtained a general permission from any of the courts to conduct cases are bound to take any poor man's case which the judge may intrust to them. Even those, however, who regularly appear in the courts on behalf of clients do not possess the privileges either of counsel or agents, and are considered merely in the position of mandatories. At the close of a suit the fee of the mandatory, if the principal desire it, is fixed by the court, which may also authorize the mandatory to retain his principal's papers until payment. A mandatory is responsible for the proper conduct of the case, and is liable to be sued if his principal suffer

through his fault or neglect. He is also liable to be fined for advising unfounded lawsuits, or conducting a case which he knew to be unjust. The increase of commerce has tended to give greater importance to those who practise in the courts, and at present the system is in a state of transition between the older and simpler condition of things, and a more elaborate system suited to the complexity of modern life.

There are many other peculiarities connected with the administration of justice in Sweden, such as the special protection thrown over the press by the Constitution, which allows of jury trial in cases affecting the freedom of the press alone, and the provisions of the criminal law, which might have been brought within the scope of this paper. To have done so would, however, have required treatment at greater length than would have been of general interest.

—*Scottish Journal of Jurisprudence.*

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

August 11, 1876.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 96½	Annuities, April, '85, 91
Ditto for Account, Sept., '96½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 96½	Ex Bills, £1000, 24 per Ct. 22 pm
New 3 per Cent., 96½	Ditto, £500, Do, 22 pm
Do 3½ per Cent., Jan., '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, 22 pm
Do 2½ per Cent., Jan., '94	Bank of England Stock, — per
Do 5 per Cent., Jan., '73	Ot. (last half-year), 253
Annuities, Jan., '80 —	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 166	Ditto 5½ per Cent., May, '79, 87
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.,
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct., '88, 104	April, '64
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do, Do, 3 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto Encased Pyr., 4 per Cent. 82	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
2nd Enf. Fr., 4 per C., Jan. '72	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	—
Stock Caledonian	100	124½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	106
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	46½
Stock Great Northern	100	132½
Stock Do., A Stock	100	133½
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	109½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	124
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	120½ x d
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	22½
Stock London and North-Western	100	148½
Stock London and South-Western	100	124½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	73 x d
Stock Metropolitan	100	103½ x d
Stock Do., District	100	48½
Stock Midland	100	130½
Stock North British	100	95½
Stock North Eastern	100	157½
Stock North London	100	137
Stock North Staffordshire	100	67
Stock South Devon	100	69
Stock South-Eastern	100	127 x d

* A. receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank return this week shows that the reserve is still increasing, the proportion to liabilities being now nearly 59 per cent. In the foreign market Egyptian stocks are in demand, and other stocks remain steady in price at about the same value as last week. Home railways, with the exception of Great Western, which are 2 down, are nearly all 1 per cent. higher. Consols close 96½ to 96½ for money and account.

The directors of the Eastern Telegraph Company (Limited) invite subscriptions for the unallotted portion of £700,000 six per cent. preference shares of £10 each, at par. The debenture capital of the company amounts to £232,000, and the ordinary shares to nearly £3,700,000. The preference dividends will be payable quarterly by warrants forwarded to the shareholders, and will not be

contingent upon the profits of each year, but any deficiency will be paid out of the revenue of subsequent years. The net revenue of the company for the year ending September 30, 1875, after paying all charges and interest on the debenture debt, was £242,761, and the dividends paid on the ordinary share capital since the formation of the company in 1872 have never been less than 5 per cent. per annum. Holders of preference shares will be entitled to attend all general meetings of the company, but not to vote thereat.

BIRTH.

LAING—Aug. 2, at 8, Park-villas, Lower Norwood, the wife of Malcolm Laing, of Lincoln's-inn, and 2, Plowden-buildings, Temple, of a son.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, AUG. 4, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Great Australian Gold Mining Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has fixed Tuesday, Aug 16, at 12, at the chambers of V.C. Malins, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator.

Great Mountain Silver Lead Mining Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Henry Tilly, Victoria buildings, Queen Victoria st. St. Paul's, O t 26, at 12, appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Lavatories Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated July 25, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Rowley and Co. Great Winchester st buildings, petitioners.

Manor Silkestone Coal Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated July 25, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Cowdell and Co, Bulge row, Cannon st, agents for the petitioners. Ashton-under-Lyde, solicitors for the petitioner.

National Funds Assurance Company, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Wednesday, Aug 16, at 12, at the chambers of V.C. Malins, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator.

Northampton Coal, Iron, and Wagon Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated July 26, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Miller and Miller, Sherborne lane, solicitors for the petitioner.

Pirch Silverine Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated July 14, appointed William Henry Bond, Victoria buildings, Queen Victoria st, to be official liquidator.

Sao Pedro Brazil Gas Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Aug 1, directed to be heard before the M.R. on the first petition day in Michaelmas Sittings. Palmer and Co, Trafalgar sq, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, AUG 8, 1876.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Bodmin Railway Company.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Silvanus William Jenkin, Liskeard, Cornwall. Tuesday, Nov 7, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order dated July 10, appointed Edward Hart, Moorgate st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Oct 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Wednesday, Nov 8, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

British Seaweed Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated June 12, re-appointed John Neilson Oathorn and, 8, Bath st, G as row, and John Sawyer, Adelaide place, London bridge, to be official liquidators.

Direct Iron and Steel Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order, dated July 10, appointed William Thomas Ogden, Austin friars, to be official liquidator.

Geffo Gas Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 9, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Wilkins and Blyth, St Swithin's lane, solicitors for the petitioners.

Industrial Coal and Iron Company, Limited. Petition for winding up, presented July 28, directed to be heard before the M.R. on the first petition day in Michaelmas Sittings. Bell and Co, Bow churchyard, agents for Rogers and Co, Sheffield, solicitors for the petitioner.

Mineral Hill Silver Mines Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Turquand, (Tokenhouse yard). Wednesday, Nov 16, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

National Funds Assurance Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated July 29, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Beall, Queen's buildings, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioner.

Tynswydd Iron and Tin Plate Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Aug 3, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on

Nor 8. Carke and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Farr and Wade, Newport, solicitors for the positioners.

Yorkshire Civil Service Service-Supply Association, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 20 to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Wood Pickard, Leeds. Thursday, Nov 2, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, AUG 4, 1876.

Jubilee Improved Friendly Society, Golden Fleece, Bermondsey wall, Bermondsey. Aug 3.
Oxfordshire Friendly and Medical Society, Oxford. Aug 1.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1876.

Capes, George, Park st, Greenvicar square, Esq. Oct 2. Capes v Dalton, V.C. Mills. Ullithorpe, Field court, Gray's inn
Cunningham, Francis, Clarendon rd, South Kensington, Lieut Colonel Madras Army. Oct 2. Anderson v Cunningham, V.C. Hall.
Cooke and Jones, Sergeants' inn, Chancery lane
Daniels, Thomas, Halford-cum-Rose, Cheshire, Weaver. Sept 5.
Wood v Daniels, M.R. Johnson, 8 Cockport
Davies, Jacob, Hensall, Carnarvon, Farmer. Oct 2. Davies v Davies, V.C. Malins. Lloyd, Lampeter
Dye, Robert, Northwold, Norfolk, Farmer. Sept 1. Carter v Dye, V.C. Hall. Hitchen, Theoford
Green, William, Byker, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Builder. Oct 10. Green v Green, V.C. Hall. Briggall, Jun, Durham
Grist, James, Midhurst, Sussex, Build r. Oct 1. Durman v Grist, V.C. Bacon. Lucas, Midhurst
Haire, William Harland, Little Haywood, Staff rd, Innkeeper. Oct 10.
Haire v Haire, V.C. Hall. Hand and Co, Stafford

TUESDAY, AUG 1, 1876.

Bosworth, Rev Joseph, Oxford. Sept 15. Huskins v Holt, V.C. Hall.
Parkers, Bedford row
Donald, George Marshall Steel, Newcas-le-upon-Tyne. Sept 6.
Marks v Donald, M.R. Wallace, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Lendrum, Mary Ann, Clifton, Bristol. Sept 8. Lendrum v Lendrum, M.R. Grestorex, Chancery lane
Richardson, Richard, Harring on square. Sept 1. Richardson v Kelly, V.C. Malins. Surtees, Bedford row
Summers, Edmund, Northrepps, Norfolk, Builder. Sept 6. Boswell v Gurney, M.R. Hannell, Norwich
Thomas, Mary Ann, Canrady, Glamorgan. Sept 20. Hill v Gibbon, V.C. Malins. Williams, Cardiff
Thomas, Thomas, Brecegar, Kent, Gent. Sept 21. Mealey v Moaley, V.C. Hall. Milman, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
Turrell, James, Charlton st, Somers town, Gent. Sept 7. Turrell v Turrell, M.R. Lickorish, Walbrook

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, AUG 1, 1876.

Arnold, James, Woodford, Gent. Aug 31. Shiffeld and Sons, Lime st
Cotts, Joseph, Birmingham, Architect. Sept 30. Wood and Son, Birmingham
Davies, Nathaniel, Amsterdam, Holland, Esq. Sept 1. Dawes and Sons, Angel court, Throgmorton st
Dawney, Charles, Bath. Sept 2. Naunton, Chapside
Foster, William, Princes end, Tipton, Stafford, Yeoman. Aug 27. Round, Tipton
Furness, William, Halifax, York. Sept 1. H.H. Halifax
Garding, Robert Ogilvie, Lee, Kent, Lieut Col Indian Army. Aug 25. Brooks, and Co, Goddian st
Gordon, Lewis Danbar Bradie, Tottenham, Hertford, Civil Engineer. Sept 19. Horne and Hunter, Lincoln's inn fields
Harris, Hannah, Broadway, Westminster. Aug 31. Webb and Co, Argyle st, Regent st
Holt, John, Great Berkhampstead, Hertford, Furniture Dealer. Sept 1. Bullock, G cat Berkhampstead
Howard, Mary Ann, Liverpool. Oct 25. Martin, Liverpool
Hoy, James, Grove st, Camden town. Aug 28. Tyler, Lincoln's inn fields
Jenkins, Thomas, Crewe Town, Cheshire, Yeoman. Dec 25. Cooke, Crewe
Keat, William, Saint Ivo, Cornwall, Farmer. Sept 29. Nicolls, Callington
Mackay, Milbro, Richmond, Surrey. Sept 11. Mills and Lookyer, Brunswic place, City rd
Metcalfe, Philip, Huddersfield, York. Oct 31. Bottomley, Huddersfield
Mowm, John William, Royton, nr Oldham, Lancashire, Esq. Sept 28. Canfield and Co, Manchester
Moxy, Arling, Winthorpe, Lincoln, Fisherman. Aug 25. Bassitt, Wainst
Moreley, Mary Ann, Harrogate, York. Aug 22. Wise and Son, Ripon
Noble, Isaac, Sains Bee, Cumberland, Gent. Aug 31. Postheltwaite and Brown, Whitehaven
Woodcock, Sarah, Dover, Kent. Sept 2. Knockor, Dover

FRIDAY, AUG 4, 1876.

Anderson, Thomas Darnley, Waverley Abbey, nr Farnham, Surrey, Esq. Sept 30. Woodroffe and Plaskitt, New sq, Lincoln's inn
Anfeld, George, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. Aug 11. Wilson, Hull
Austin, George, Chilton Farm, Kent, Farmer. Sept 13. Cardor, Dover
Bamlett, George, Sunderland, Durham, Painter. Aug 31. Alcock, Jan, Sunderland
Baruchson, Arnold de Beer, The Boltons, South Kensington, Esq. Oct 20. Torr and Co, Bedford row
Bath, John Drew, Alaburth, nr Liverpool, Car Proprietor. Sept 27. Clays and Son, Manchester

Blackburn, Jane Mary, Edith rd, Peckham. Sept 29. Pattison and Co, Queen Victoria st
Blakeborough, John Mangle, Marton, Lancashire, Gent. Sept 1. Sutcliffe, Burnley
Buckley, James, Birmingham, Peer Siller. Sept 29. Allen, Birmingham
Burley, James, Stotford, Bedford, Labourer. Sept 2. Wright, Amphill
Bushnell, Elizabeth, Bristol. Oct 4. Miller, Bristol
Chamberlain, Robert, Norwich, Esq. Oct 1. Coaks, Norwich
Clayton, Thomas, Stanley House, nr Ripley, York, Esq. Nov 1. Barr and Co, Leeds
Cotching, John, Taddington, Bedford, Farmer. Sept 11. Newton, Leighton Buzzard
Cutbush, William, Barnet Herts. Nurseryman. Dec 25. Boyes, Barne t
Dixon, William, North Shields, Northumberland. Sept 1. Fenwick, North Shields
Green, Emanuel, Walcot, Oxford, Farmer. Oct 1. Saunders, Chipping Norton
Harrop, John, Cheetham, Manchester. Sept 22. Clays and Son, Manchester
Harley, William, Kendal, Westmorland, Baker. Sept 8. Thomson and Wilson, Kendal
Headland, Rev Edward, Dorchester, Dorset. Sept 15. Thomson, Bedford row
Heaven, Harriett, Bristol. Oct 10. Wood, Bristol
Hester, George Parsons, Oxford, Town Clerk. Sept 1. Hesters, Oxford
Hudson, Thomas, Coptorne, Sussex, Wood Dealer. Sept 1. Head and Sons, East Grinstead
Hutchinson, William John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Coalowner. Oct 1. Philipson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Jowett, James, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Esq. Nov 1. Brooks and Co, Ashton-under-Lyne
Kewood, George, Chichester, Tailor. Sept 14. Raper and Freeland, Chichester
Ledsard, William, Roundhay, York, Esq. Nov 1. Barr and Co, Leeds
Lucklin, George, Albion rd, Holloway, Laundryman. Sept 13. Naunton, Chapside
Manthorpe, George Lemon, Southtown, Suffolk, Gent. Sept 30. Holt, Great Yarmouth
Mastcalfe, Agnes, Taddington, Bedford, Sept 11. Newton, Leighton Buzzard
Mitchell, Abraham, Mansell-passage, Mansell st, Goodman's fields. Aug 28. Davis, Basil ghall st
Moffatt, Robert, New asse-upon-Tyne, Draper. Sept 1. Fleming, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Norris, Richard, Oxford, Gent. Sept 1. Hesters, Oxford
Paget, John Henry, Naupanton, Leicester, Esq. Sept 14. Harris, Crich
Penchey, Thomas Emerson, Colchester, Essex, Upholsterer. Sept 1. Pope, Colchester
Pitt, Job, Dudley, Worcester, Maltster. Oct 10. Sanders and Smith, Dudley
Pratt, Erasmus Crake, Salford Priory, Warwick, Merchant. Oct 2. Hobbs and Slater, Salford-upon-Avon
Rowlands, Samuel Griffiths, Chester, Tailor. Aug 30. Walker and Smith, Chester
Stanbridge, Sidney William, Cma-bark, Camberwell, Maltster. Sept 29. Pattison and Co, Queen Victoria st
Stillwell, Thomas, Dorking, Surrey, Esq. Sept 19. Wynne and Son, Lincoln's inn fields
Taylor, Elizabeth, Margate, Kent. Oct 1. Walters and Gash, Finsbury circus
Thomas, Charles Angus, Eaing, Middlesex, Paymaster R.N. Sept 29. Pattison and Co, Queen Victoria st
Trimnell, Henry Georg, Canterbury, Jeweller. Sept 19. Cardor, Dover
Warren, James, Great Fenton, Stafford, Gent. Feb. 2. Hawley, Loughton
Warren, William, Stapenhill, Derby, Farmer. Nov 1. Drewrys, Burton-on-Trent
Wishin, Emma, Bushey Heath, Herts. Sept 1. Mott, Paternoster row
Woodhouse, Henry John Cam Frederic, Phillip's rd, Dalton, Accountant. Sept 30. Chantrell and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

TUESDAY, AUG 8, 1876.

Bridgewater, Martha, Summertown, Oxford. Sept 16. Mallams, Oxford
Bullock, John, Canonbury park north, Gent. Sept 29. Smith, King
Gardiner, Edwin, Chalf rd, Gloucester, Gent. Nov 1. Kearsey and Parsons, Stroud
Graham, James, Woolwich, Kent, Major R.H.A. Sept 8. Farnfield and San pon, Queen Victoria st
Green, Phoebe, Southampton, Saddler. Sept 20. J. J. Barnett, High st, Southampton
Knollys, John Weldo, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Esq. Sept 30. Lindsey and Co, Basinghall st
L'Am, Margaret Sinclair, Newbury, Berks. Sept 4. Lucas, Newbury
Marshall, William, Boston, Lincoln, Yeoman. Oct 1. Simpson and Co, Boston
Middleton, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Silversmith. Sept 5. Garbutt, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Mildinton, Dorothy Catherine, Taddington, Middlesex. Oct 1. Simpson and Co, Boston
Morley, Mary Ann, Belper, Derby. Sept 1. Walker, Belper
Oliver, John, Kirtan, Lincoln, Gent. Oct 1. Simpson and Co, Boston
Osborne, Thomas James, Abbey cottages, Kilbourn, Plate Chest Maker. Sept 4. Wells, Percy st, Bedford sq
Pearson, Charles, Llanecoston, Cornwall. Aug 31. C. H. Burt, High st, Windor
Phillips, John, Oswestry, Salop, Gent. Sept 1. Davies, Oswestry
Phillips, John Hopkins, Oswestry, Salop, Draper. Sept 1. Davies, Oswestry
Preston, Edward, Eccles, Lancashire, Gent. Sept 29. Smith and Boyer, Manchester

Rudnall, William Henry, Ulverston, Lancashire, Chemist. Sept 2.
Remington, Ulverston
Turner, Thomas, Kingston, Hereford, Miller. Sept 15. Tidd and Co,
Kington
Winstanley, John, Manchester, Bookbinder. Aug 22. Sale and Co,
Manchester

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Aug. 4, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

McCulloch, Hugh, Thomas, and Henry Perrin, Mincing lane, Chemical
Merchants. Pet Aug 1. Keene. Aug 16 at 1
Fandys, Frederick, Spencer at, Westminster, Artist. Pet July 29.
Keene. Aug 16 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Barrett, Robert Maynard, Bicester, Oxford, Sacking Manufacturer.
Pet Aug 2. Bishop. Oxford, Aug 14 at 12
Cash, Ebenezer William, Southampton, Lancashire, Gent. Pet July 31.
Watson. Liverpool, Aug 15 at 2
Knott, Joseph, and Edmund Knott, Sheffield, Steel Manufacturers. Pet
July 31. Wake. Sheffield, Aug 15 at 11
Mawson, Henry, and Joseph Walker, Gildersome, York, Stonemasons.
Pet Aug 2. Marshall. Leeds, Aug 23 at 11
Maxey, Henry, Heywood, Lancashire, General Draper. Pet Aug 1.
Holden. Bolton, Aug 21 at 11
Paton, Walter, Liverpool, Shipowner. Pet July 28. Bellringer. Liver-
pool, Aug 21 at 2
Pitt, Thomas, Birmingham, Builder. Pet Aug 2. Parry. Birming-
ham, Aug 19 at 11
Smithies, James, Middleton, Lancashire, Silk Ribbon Manufacturer.
Pet Aug 2. Tweedale. Oldham, Aug 23 at 11
Walker, Henry, Leeds, Commission Agent. Pet Aug 2. Marshall.
Leeds, Aug 23 at 11

TUESDAY, Aug. 8, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Coninsby, Charles, Penton at, Pentonville, Cheshiremonger. Pet Aug 4.
Keene. Aug 16 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Beames, Pearson Thomas, Stegursay, Somerset, Esq. Pet Aug 5.
Meyler. Taunton, Aug 21 at 12
Bowley, William, Worcester, Grocer. Pet Aug 3. Crisp. Worcester,
Aug 25 at 12
Cariss, Rev Walter Henry, Cloughton, York. Pet July 15. Woodall.
Scarborough, Aug 16 at 3
Chinn, Edward William, Huddersfield, York, Jeweller. Pet Aug 3.
Jones, jun. Huddersfield, Aug 22 at 11
Kirby, Joseph, Penrith, Cumberland, Woolen Draper. Pet Aug 5.
Haltom, Carlisle, Aug 21 at 3
Knock, Thomas Baker, Glemsford, Suffolk, Grocer. Pet Aug 3. Barnes.
Colchester, Aug 23 at 12
Smith, Charles Henry, Bromyard, Hereford, Butcher. Pet Aug 5.
Crisp. Worcester, Aug 26 at 12
Smith, George H., New Nymanton, Derby, Builder. Pet Aug 4.
Weller. Derby, Aug 24 at 12
Wicks, Samuel, Hertford, Baker. Pet Aug 5. Spence. Hertford,
Aug 26 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Aug. 4, 1876.

Pire, William, Brixham, Devon, Fish Salesman. July 19
Whitely, Edward, Shrewsbury, Salop, Butcher. Aug 2

TUESDAY, Aug. 8, 1876.

Hutchison, Adeline, Brighton, Sussex. June 10
Jones, Thomas, Charlotte st, Portland place, Brewer. July 29
Walker, William Mott, Cardington st, Euston square, Medical Assis-
tant. Aug 3

Liquidation by Arrangement.**FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

FRIDAY, Aug. 4, 1876.

Ackland, Charles, Evelyn at, Lower rd, Driford, China Dealer. Aug
16 at 12 at offices of Gamble and Harvey, Gresham buildings,
Basinghall st. Lockyer, Gresham buildings
Austin, John, Great Gidding, Huntingdon Blacksmith. Aug 28 at 11
at offices of Richardson and son, Oundle
Berham, William, Chelchworth, Ken., Baker. Aug 22 at 10 at the Bull's
Head Ho of Chichester. King Fish hill
Blythe, David, Manchester, Antiquar. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of
Cobbett and Co Brown st, Manchester
Bragg, Charles Henry, Bristol, Baker. Aug 17 at 2 at offices of Hobbs,
Clarke, Bristol
Brazil, George, London rd, Potato Salesman. Aug 14 at 2 at offices
of Kotwell, Chancery lane
Bull, William Richard, Birmingham, General Merchant. Aug 17 at 12
at the Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st, Birmingham, Jell,
Birmingham
Chatter, Herbert, Ealing, Middlesex, no business. Aug 31 at 2 at the
Castle Inn, Brentford. Hendons, 6-sex st, Strand
Conway, John Harris, jun, Abergavenny, M. mouth, Lime Merchant.
Aug 24 at 3 at the King's Head Hotel, Newport. Jones, Abergavenny

Cotterill, George Thomas, Gravesend, Kent, Pilot. Aug 16 at 11 at
offices of Fenner and Co, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Essex,
Colchester
Crockford, George Lepard, Nottingham, Jeweller. Aug 21 at 12 at
offices of Fraser, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
Cockney, Caroline, Boston mews, Dorset square, Farrier. Aug 16 at 11
at offices of Berkeley, Marylebone rd
Cuts, Solomon Charles, Lower Rosoman at, Clerkenwell, Gold Refiner.
Aug 15 at 1 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
Denman, James Charles, Aldershot, Hants, Saddler. Aug 15 at 2 at
the Royal Exchange Hotel, High st, Aldershot. Eve, Aldershot
Dent, John, Croydon, out of business. Aug 15 at 2 at the Priory
Albert, Mitcham rd, Croydon
Ellis, Richard, and Willam Ellis, Liverpool, O 1 Manufacturers. Aug
16 at 3 at offices of Lupton, Harrington st, Liverpool
Elmor, Joseph, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tobaccoist. Aug 17 at 3 at
offices of Jacobs, County buildings, Kingston-upon-Hull
Everitt, John Hurry, Mariner West End, Hants, Farmer. Aug 17
at 1.30 at the Great Northern Hotel, Peterborough. Camwack
Ferguson, James, Jarrow-on-Tyne, Durham, Fruiterer. Aug 15 at 2
at offices of Jones, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Fisher, John, and Robert Fisher, Preston, Lancashire, Joiners. Aug 16
at 3 at offices of Forshaw, Cannon st, Preston
Fletcher, Septimus, Stalybridge, Lancashire, Grocer. Aug 18 at 3 at
Whitehead, Stamford st, Stalybridge
Gibbo, George, Withernwick, York, Grocer. Aug 22 at 11 at offices of
Julian, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull
Goodfellow, Felix Charles, and James Edward Goodfellow, St Bride's
st, Ludgate Circus, Booksellers. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Lewis and
Co, Old Jewry
Green, Oliver Astley, Manchester, General Dealer. Aug 21 at 11 at
offices of Burton, King st, Manchester
Griffith, John, Llanrwst, Denbigh, Grocer. Aug 16 at 1 at the Queen's
Hotel, Chester. Jones, Conway
Groom, Josiah, Shrewsbury, Salop, Photographer. Aug 15 at 11 at
offices of Morris, Swan hill, Shrewsbury
Hall, Joseph, Manchester, Boiler Maker. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of
Gardner, Brown st, Manchester
Hannab, James Bruce, Liverpool, Leather Dealer. Aug 17 at 2 at
offices of Harris, Union court, Liverpool
Hargrave, John, Leeds, Stone Mason. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Ford
and Son, Albion terrace, Leeds
Hillier, William Henry, Birmingham H-ath, Blacking Manufacturer.
Aug 19 at 11 at offices of Barton, Union passage, Birmingham
Holdforth, James, and Walter Holdforth, Leeds, Silk Spinners. Aug 21
at 2 at office of Bond and Barwick, Albion place, Leeds
Hollingham, Thomas, Gravesend, Kent, Grocer. Aug 17 at 12 at office
of Walker and Co, Founders' Hall, St Swithin's lane. Bowley, Graves-
end
Holt, Charles, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Silk Thrower. Aug 16 at 3 at
offices of Barclay and Henscock, Exchange chambers, Macclesfield
Hock, Emmanuel, Stafford, Wood Truss Hoop Manufacturer. Aug
15 at 11 at offices of Bowen, Stafford
Houghton, Joshua, Leeds, Furniture Broker. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of
Hewson, East carac, Leeds
Howe, Joseph Mason, Newington, York, Chemist. Aug 15 at 12 at
offices of Walker and Spink, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull
Hutches, Owen, Liverpool, Cartowner. Aug 17 at 2 at offices of
Williams, Lord st, Liverpool
Jackson, Thomas, Accrington, Lancashire, Draper. Aug 18 at 2 at
the Derby Hotel, St James's at, Accrington. Wansley, Accrington
Johnson, James, Carlisle, Cumberland, Pumber. Aug 17 at 3 at offices
of Dobinson and Watson, Bank st, Carlisle
King, William, Idle, Calverley, out of business. Aug 16 at 3 at the
Roebuck Inn, Stamford. Burley
Kirby, Henry William, Beeston, Nottingham, Hatter. Aug 21 at 3
at the Assembly Rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Cranch and
Stroud, Nottingham
Knuth, George, Bristol, Cabinet Maker. Aug 16 at 2 at offices of
Campbell and Salmon, Stephen at, Bristol
Krzyszowski, Stanislas, Campbell buildings, Rys lane, Peckham,
Watch Maker. Aug 17 at 12 at offices of Bines, Basinghall st.
Mason, North buildings, Finsbury
Lambard, Edgar, Saxmundham, Suffolk, Boot Mkr. Aug 21 at 3 at
the White Hart Hotel, Saxmundham. Poland
Lawrie, James, Birkdale, Lancashire, Resistant Precursor. Aug
21 at 2 at the Minerva Hotel, Walg to, Wigton. Wood, Wigton
Lees, Daniel, Wigan, Lancashire, Ironmonger. Aug 21 at 11 at offices
of Ashton, King st, Wigan
Leonard, John Richard Look, Chippenham, Wilts, Innkeeper. Aug 18
at 10 at the Angel Hotel, Chippenham. Wood, Chippenham
Lewis, James, 25th, Fork Butcher. Aug 16 at 11 at 5, Westgate build-
ings, Bath. Wilton
Little John, Whit-haven, Cumberland, Licensed Victualler. Aug 18
at 3 at offices of Brockbank and Heider, Whit-haven
Lowe John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Beer-eller. Aug 17 at 3 at offices
of Wilcock, North st, Wolverhampton
Lund, Henry William Adrian, Gravesend, Kent, Surgeon. Aug 24 at
2 at offices of G-briel, Lincoln's Inn fields
Malpass, Daniel, Horst green, Sussex, Blacksmith. Aug 18 at 12 at
the Swan Hotel, Tunbridge well. Cammace, Hastings
Marche, L. Michael, White, New, a Joseph-lye Grocer. Aug 15 at 3
at offices of Stanford, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Page, Newton Thomas, King st, Clerkenwell, Manufacturing
Jeweller. Aug 15 at 11 at offices of Evans and Eagles, Junn st,
Bedford row
Palmer, Frederick, Bath, Hardware Dealer. Aug 15 at 10.30 at 3,
Wood st, Bath. Rogers
Pinkerton, John, Manchester, Skirt Manufacturer. Aug 18 at 3 at offices
of Adleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
Plumier, Christian, and Charles Bile, Essex at, Mare st, Hookner,
Boot Manufacturers. Aug 14 at 11 at offices of George and Pinder,
Wood Exchange, Coleman st, Archer, Westrip at, Finsbury
Puffer, John King, Good Easter, Essex, Westwight. Aug 25 at 2
at the Corn Exchange, Chelmsford. Darnfield and Bruty, Chelms-
ford

Balfour, John, Middleborough, Grocer. Aug 23 at 2 at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds. Trotter
 Richardson, William Henry, Wallington, S. river, Bailiff. Aug 16 at 2 at the Star and a Pennell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.
 Rawson, Cannon st.
 Robinson, Francis, Catherine court, Seething lane, Malt Factor. Aug 16 at 11 at offices of Cox and Sons, Clock lane, Cannon st.
 Scott, Henry, Goldsmith, Surfer, Nurseryman. Aug 15 at 2 at the King's Arms Hotel, Goldsmithing. Div. Goldsmithing
 Shaw, Thomas, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Tailor. Aug 18 at 12 at offices of Brooks, Church st, Woodbridge
 Shephard, Thomas Synnons Dennis, Great Winchester st, Silk Merchant. Aug 18 at 11 at offices of Howard and Co, New Bridge st.
 Smith, Robert Blackie, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Grocer. Aug 21 at 11 at offices of Oswald and Co, Badger row, Cannon st, Wiltshire, Great Yarmouth
 Smith, David, and Alfred Smith, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Wine Merchants. Aug 16 at 12 at offices of Monkhouse and Co, Ramsden square, Barrow-in-Furness. Johnson and Tilley, Lancaster
 Sowerbutts, William, Jun, Nantwich, Cheshire, Boot Clicker. Aug 21 at 2 at offices of Cooke, Temple chambers, Cove
 Stalker, John James, Ipswich, Suffolk, Toy Dealer. Aug 16 at 11 at offices of Mills, Elm st, Ipswich
 Stanley, James, and Frederick Charles Standley, Watton, Norfolk. Aug 12 at 12 at the Registrar's Office, Redwell st, Norwich. Gregson and Robinson
 Stenemon, Samuel, and Robert Stenemon, Accrington, Lancashire, Contractors. Aug 17 at 2 at the Victoria Hotel, Preston. Tattersall, Blackburn
 Thomas, John Morgan, Chesham, Buckingham, Tailor. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Webb, Austin friars
 Vincent, John, Bramfield, Suffolk, Miller. Aug 22 at 2 at the Angel Hotel, Halesworth. Jones, Colchester
 Wagstaff, Edwin Henry, and Joseph Whately, Birmingham, Manufacturers of Fancy Leather Goods. Aug 17 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Waller, Thomas, Huddersfield, York, Builder. Aug 24 at 3 at offices of Leary and Co, Buxton rd, Huddersfield
 Warkin, Henry, Halton, Cheshire, Agricultural Implement Maker. Aug 21 at 11 at offices of Linaker, Bank chambers, Runcorn
 Watson, Arthur, Barnley, York, Ironmonger. Aug 17 at 3 at the Commercial Hotel, Albion st, Leeds
 Watson, Henry, and Arthur, Lorkin, Manor place, Waltham rd, Grocers. Aug 14 at 3 at offices of Hicklin and Washington, Trinity square, Southwark
 Watson, William James, Whitefriars st, Wood Engraver. Aug 16 at 2 at offices of Low, Clifford's inn
 Webb, Charles, Frome, Somerset, Baker. Aug 16 at 12 at offices of McCarthy, King st, Frome
 Westcott, John, Gloucester. Aug 15 at 3 at offices of Haines, St John's lane, Gloucester
 Whinfield, James, North Seale, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Aug 12 at 2 at Sharp's Temperance Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Dickinson
 Whitley, Mary Louisa, Bradford, York, Boot Maker. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Singleton, New Booth st, Market st, Bradford
 Williams, William, and Alfred Williams, Newport, Monmouth, Builders. Aug 18 at 12 at offices of Lloyds, Bank chambers, Newport
 Williamson, George, The Grove, Hackney, Boot Maker. Aug 12 at 11 at offices of Goldberg, Commercial st, Whitechapel. Tripp, Exeter
 Woolaston, William, Birmingham, Guard Chain Manufacturer. Aug 12 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Young, Charles Fox Bennett, Wadley bridge, York, Manager of Brick Works. Aug 14 at 11 at offices of Legge, George st, Sheffield. Egan, Sheffield

TUESDAY, Aug. 8, 1875.

Clayton, Henry, Manchester, Brower. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Needham and Co, York st, Manchester
 Cleaton, Edmund, Llandiloes, Montgomery, Flannel Manufacturer. Aug 18 at 2.30 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester.
 Blair, Manchester
 Collins, John, New cross rd, Deptford, Cheshamonger. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Harris, Southwark st, Southwark
 Copland, Henry, Carrie, and Edward James Rudgard Wizz, Cannon st, China Merchants. Aug 26 at 10.30 at offices of Roberts, Coleman st
 Cowart, James, Exeter, Hairdresser. Aug 21 at 12 at offices of Payton, Cassin st, Exeter
 Cowley, Albert, Brighton, Sussex, Restaurant Keeper. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Nye, North st, Brighton
 Craighead, George, Leeds, Draper. Aug 18 at 3 at offices of Crowther and Co, Britannia buildings, Oxford place, Leeds. Watson, York
 Cross, Charles, North Malvern, Worcester, Builder. Aug 18 at 3 at offices of Corbetta, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester
 Cross, Thomas, Leeds, Japanner. Aug 18 at 3 at offices of Brooks, Bond st, Leeds
 Curtis, Selina, Ilkeston, Derby, Draper. Sept 1 at 12 at offices of Brille, St Peter's chambers, St Peter's gate, Nottingham
 Davies, Daniel, Liverpool, Linnendraper. Aug 21 at 2 at offices of Harris, Union court, Castle st, Liverpool
 Davies, Evan, Talsarn, Cardigan, Innkeeper. Aug 19 at 3 at offices of Lloyd, High st, Lampeter
 Dean, Mary, Manchester, Beer Retailer. Aug 25 at 3 at offices of Garthwaite, Brasenose st, Manchester
 Drake, John, Nottingham, Baker. Aug 21 at 11 at offices of Black, Low pavement, Nottingham
 Emerson, John, Blackburn, Lancashire, Tailor. Aug 22 at 11 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Scit, Blackburn
 Fisher, Henry, Manchester, Waterproof. Aug 28 at 3 at offices of Clayton, St James's square, Manchester
 Flindger, Edmund Samuel, Belvedere, York, Auctioneer. Aug 19 at 2.45 at offices of Gooch, Belvedere Railway Station. Cooper, Chancery lane
 Gardner, James, Batley, York, Bookkeeper. Aug 25 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway, Church st, Dewsbury
 Garnde, Gabriel, Rochdale, Lancashire, Share Broker. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Standring, King st, South parade, Rochdale
 Gelling, Matthew Harrison, Hyde, Isle of Wight, Ironmonger. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Durant, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st
 Gillespie, Alexander, Rochdale, Lancashire, Tailor. Aug 18 at 3 at the Wheat Sheaf Hotel, Fennell st, Manchester. Standring, Rochdale
 Goodwin, Robert, Newton Heath, nr Manchester, Winder. Aug 25 at 8 at offices of Leigh, Brown st, Manchester
 Graham, Harry, jun, Brighton, Sussex, Carver. Aug 31 at 12 at offices of Fisher and Co, Leicester square
 Green, James, Oldham, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. Aug 21 at 11 at the King's Arms Hotel, Oldham. Blackburne and Co, Oldham
 Haley, Thomas Wood, Dewsbury, York, Coal Merchant. Aug 22 at 11 at the Scarbrough Hotel, Dewsbury. Ridgway
 Hankinson, William, Southport, Lancashire, Tailor. Aug 21 at 12 at the Royal Hotel, Dals st, Liverpool. Walton, Southport
 Harrison, James, and Thomas Whitman, Book Foot Mill, nr Bingley, York, Silk Spinners. Aug 19 at 10 at offices of Watson and Dickson, Victoria chambers, Market st, Bradford
 Hey, Tom, Sherburn, York, Innkeeper. Aug 19 at 12 at offices of Crowther, Britannia buildings, Oxford place, Leeds. Rhodes
 Hickman, Samuel, Leeds, Watch Maker. Aug 21 at 2 at the Midland Hotel, Birmingham. Simpson and Barrell
 Hindson, John, Birmingham, Wholesale Warehouseman. Aug 18 at 12 at offices of Beese and Harris, New st, Birmingham
 Hives, John, jun, Reading, Berks, Schoolmaster. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Beale and Martin, London st, Reading
 Holmes, William, Woodville, Leicester, out of business. Aug 21 at 11 at the Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton-on-Trent. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent
 Hunt, Thomas, Miles Platting, Lancashire, Shopkeeper. Aug 21 at 3 at the Black Horse Inn, Oldham rd, Manchester
 Hurst, John, sen, Rampton, Nottingham, Cottager. Aug 25 at 11 at offices of Marshall and Co, East Retford
 Jones, Hester, Hereford, Grocer. Aug 16 at 10.30 at offices of Corner, High Town, Hereford
 Jones, Thomas Frederick, Liverpool, Pawnbroker. Aug 18 at 3 at offices of Gibson, North John st, Liverpool. Norris and Sons, Liverpool
 Jenkins, Moses, Penygraig Dinas, Glamorgan, Stationer. Aug 21 at 12 at offices of Alexander, Inscut chambers, Pontypool
 Jenkinson, Henry, and John Jenkinson, Fenton, Stafford, Builders. Aug 21 at 11 at offices of Tennant, Cheapside, Hanley
 Jepson, Richard Henry, Manchester, Hat Manufacturer. Aug 25 at 3 at offices of Addeleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
 Keller, Phillip, and Emil Hahn, Hatton garden, Dealers in Precious Stones. Aug 21 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Bohm, Old Jewry
 Kent, Edward, Glamis rd, Shadwell, Lighterman. Aug 28 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Birchall, Graecchurch st
 Kruger, Edwin Charles, Bristol, Commission Agent. Aug 27 at 11 at offices of Smith and Co, Shannon court, Corn st, Bristol. Fussell and Co, Bristol
 Lamb, Herbert Henry, Old st, Goswell rd, Manufacturer of Gymnastic Apparatus. Aug 19 at 3 at offices of Kisch, Argyll place, Regent st
 Leppman, Moss, Buckingham Palace rd, Piccolo, Watch Maker. Aug 16 at 3 at offices of Barnett, New Broad st
 Leck, James, Derby, Dealer in Cordials. Aug 28 at 3 at offices of Greston, Corn market, Derby
 Lewis, Hananias, Neath, Glamorgan, Grocer. Aug 19 at 11 at the Mackworth Hotel, Neath. Layson, Neath
 Macandrew, William, West Gorton, nr Manchester, Cut Nali Manufacturer. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Garthwaite, Brasenose st, Manchester
 Mackie, William Sharp, and William Charles Harris, Manchester, Skirt Manufacturers. Aug 29 at 11 at offices of Boote and Edgar, George st, Manchester

Mackintosh, Charles, Middlesborough, York, Ironmonger. Aug 18 at 3 at offices of Hallam, Exchange place, Middlesborough. Belk and Parrington

Maddison, George, Middlesborough, York, Provision Dealer. Aug 19 at 12 at the Half Moon Hotel, New Ebor, Durham. Peacock, Middlesborough

Mason, John, Clavering, Essex, Farmer. Aug 7 at 1 at the George Hotel, Bi-hop's Stortford. Harrison, Bermondsey at

McKenzie, George, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Travelling Draper. Aug 18 at 1 at offices of Simons and Pews, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil

Mayers, George, Hawley crescent, Camden town, Printer. Aug 25 at 3 at offices of Webbs, Austinfords

Miler, Ernest, Leeds, Grocer. Aug 21 at 2 at offices of Whiteley, Albion st, Leeds

Milton, James, South st, New North rd, Islington, Grocer. Aug 24 at 11 at offices of King, Fish at hill

Moore, William, Royal Leamington Spa, Warwick, Bricklayer. Aug 17 at 12 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Warwick

Morris, John Sherwood, Leicester, Shoe Manufacturer. Aug 25 at 13 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester

Mulloney, Samuel Whitehall, Coventry, Warwick, Trimming Manufacturer. Aug 21 at 12 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Murray, Thomas, Liverpool, Tailor. Aug 23 at 3 at offices of Harper, Cable st, Liverpool

Murton, John Woods, Wood green, Tottenham, Butcher. Aug 18 at 2 at offices of Webster and Graham, Ely place, Holborn

Offen, Essex William, Merham, Kent. Aug 22 at 4 at offices of Norwood, High st, Ashford

Page, William John, High st, Poplar, Pastry Cook. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's pond rd

Parish, Alfred, Malpas rd, New cross rd, Deptford, Gardener. Aug 17 at 2 at offices of Harris, Southwark st, Southwark

Parker, John, Henry Parks, and William Parks, Wincham, Cheshire, Silk Manufacturers. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Kershaw, Booth st, Manchester

Parks, Joseph, Wincham, Cheshire, Shipbuilder. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Hocklin, Brazennose st, Manchester

Potter, Richard, and Frederick Geary, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 28 at 12 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree gate, Leicester

Riley, Robert, Backburn, Lancashire, Tobaccoist. Aug 18 at 11 at offices of Darley, Lord st west, Blackburn

Scales, William, Welstanton, Stafford, Grocer. Aug 17 at 12 at offices of Turner, Bagnall st, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Shenton, Anthony, Longton, Stafford, Cab Proprietor. Aug 17 at 11 at offices of Tennant, Chesapeake

Shearman, Thomas, Newton butts, Seedsman. Aug 23 at 12 at offices of Davis, Harp lane, Great Tower st

Skelton, Frederick, Bethnal green rd, Tailor. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Butcher, Chesapeake, Panley

Smith, Arthur Gilbody, Leigh, Lancashire, Farmer. Aug 23 at 3 at offices of Major, Brown st, Manchester

Smith, James, Stourbridge, Worcester, Tailor. Aug 19 at 11 at offices of Homer, High st, Brerley Hill

Smith, Robert, Birmingham, Cork Manufacturer. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Wright and Marshall, New st, Birmingham

Solomons, Abraham, Liverpool, Outfitter. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Norton, Cook st, Liverpool

Stanton, Samuel Lear, Tipton, Stafford, Grocer. Aug 17 at 11 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Stephens, Thomas, and David Brewer, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, House Decorators. Aug 22 at 2 at offices of Fenner and Co, Gresham buildings, Badgashill st, St. Stephen, Coleman st

Stockwell, Alfred, Liverpool, Dealer in Sewing Machines. Aug 22 at 2 at offices of Evans and Lockett, Commerce chambers, Lord st, Liverpool

Strickland, George Washington, Leigh, Lancashire, Boot Maker. Aug 18 at 11 at offices of Richardson, Wood st, Bolton

Summers, Robert, Sunderland, Durham, out of business. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Graham, John st, Sunderland

Sykes, Lewis, Dowsbury, York, Draper. Aug 22 at 3 at offices of Chadwick and Sons, Church st, Dowsbury

Thomas, Eli, Taunton, Somerset, Lamp Dealer. Aug 16 at 11 at offices of Reed and Cook, Paul st, Taunton

Thomas, James Morgan, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Draper. Aug 19 at 11 at offices of Howell, Stappney st, Llanelly

Towns, Henry Jun, North Shields, Grocer. Aug 23 at 3 at offices of Winter, Westgate rd, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Tinley and Co, North Shields

Trow, Alfred, Ipswich, Suffolk, Builder. Aug 26 at 12 at offices of Jennings, Lower Brook at, Ipswich

Usher, Frederick Richard, Low Hansley, York, Farmer. Aug 22 at 2 at offices of Pickering, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Bantoft, Selby

Vincent, Henry, Great Coggeshall, out of business. Aug 26 at 4 at offices of Smythies and Co, Colchester

Wainwright, James, Southport, Lancashire, Toy Dealer. Aug 30 at 3 at offices of Barker, London st, Southport

Waring, William, Beeston, Nottingham, Grocer. Aug 22 at 3 at the Assembly Rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Cranch and Stroud, Nottingham

Watkins, George, Eskes, Hereford, Farmer. Aug 22 at 4.30 at the Temple Bar Inn, Ewias Harold, Corner, Hereford

Watts, George, Hirdfield, York, Builder. Aug 24 at 11 at offices of Norris and Co, Halifax

Watts, William John, Miles Platting, nr Manchester, Builder. Sept 1 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Hinde and Co, Manchester

Webb, Edward Mitchell, Greenwich, China Dealer. Aug 17 at 3 at offices of Carttar, Catherine House, Blackheath rd, Greenwich

Webb, William, Darlaston, Stafford, Galvanizer. Aug 21 at 4 at offices of Sheldon, Lower High st, Wednesbury

White, Henry, Kingston-upon-Hull, Innkeeper. Aug 21 at 12 at office of Walker and Spink, Parliament st, Hull

Wignall, James, Fenton, Stafford, Coal Dealer. Aug 17 at 11 at the Sea Lion Hotel, High st, Hanley. Ashmall, Hanley

Williams, George Edwin, Tatalyfera, Glamorgan, Grocer. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Barrard and Co, Temple st, Swansea

Williams, Mary, Laugharne, Carmarthen, Shopkeeper. Aug 19 at 11 at offices of Green and Griffiths, St Mary's st, Carmarthen

Wills, Thomas, Leicester, Leather Dealer. Aug 23 at 1 at offices of Hunter, Halford st, Leicester

Woodhouse, Elizabeth, and William Curry Woodhouse, Leeds, Tailors. Aug 22 at 2 at offices of Routh and Co, Royal Insurance buildings, Park row, Leeds. Embleys

Woolf, Thomas, Jun, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, out of business. Aug 18 at 11 at offices of Griffith, Led lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Woolford, James, Stratton St Margaret, Wilts, Wheelwright. Aug 19 at 11 at offices of Kinnair and Tombs, Corn Exchange, Swindon

Wyman, William, Hampden rd, Upper Holloway, out of business. Aug 17 at 2 at offices of Fenton, Ball's Pond rd

Young, Agnes, Westbury-on-Trym, Gloucester, Schoolmistress. Aug 21 at 1 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Bevan and Hancock, Bristol

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED)

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agn Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised. Every other description of banking business and money agency British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES. NIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS &c

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION

BAKER-STREET.—On View, portrait Models of KING ALFONSO XII. and VICTOR EMMANUEL, the Duke and Duchess of EDINBURGH, the EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, the SHAH OF PERSIA, Sir SAMUEL BAKER, the late Dr. LIVINGSTONE, Mr. H. M. STANLEY, Rev. H. WARD BEECHER, Sir GARNET WOLSELEY, MARSHAL McMAHON, MARSHAL BAZAINE, M. THIERS, the late CHARLES DICKENS, and Dr. KENNELLY, M.P. Also superb and costly Court Dresses; the complete line of British Monarchs, from William the Conqueror to Queen Victoria; and over 300 Portrait Models of Celebrated and Distinguished Characters. Admission, 1s. Children under twelve, 6d. Extra room, 6d. Open from 10 a.m. till 10 p.m.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—New Lecture by Prof.

GARDNER, BURNING and COMBUSTION, and CROOKER'S DISCOVERIES and APPARATUS, Brilliant Experiments. C. E. Heald's Diving Apparatus and Submarine Lamp. Two Divers. Diving Bell twice daily. Type Writer. Hogg's Patent Ventilation. Bateman's Collection of Model Steam Engines. Bidder's Magnetic Lamp. Tinley's Compound Pendulum, &c., &c. Admission to the whole, 1s; Schools and Children under 10, half-price.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—ALICE in WON-

DERLAND; or, More Wonders in Wonderland, New Songs, Views, and Illustrations, by Mr. GEORGE BUCKLAND, A WALK THROUGH THE TOWER, and WONDERS OF THE MICROSCOPE, by Mr. J. L. KINC. Mr. Taylor's WONDERFUL BOY; Clairvoyance and Plate Dancing extraordinary. SOLOS on the VIOLIN by Miss C. A. BROOK, of the Celebrated Brouill Family. Admission to the whole, 1s.; Schools and Children under 10, half-price.

VAUDEVILLE.

THIS EVENING, at 7.30, A WHIRLIGIG. At 8, OUR BOYS Concluding with A FEARFUL FOG; Messrs. William Farron, Thomas Thorne, Charles Sugden, C. W. Garthorne, David James; Misses Amy Roselle, Haste Bishop, Nellie Walters, Cicely Richards, Sophie Larkin, &c.